

THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF
AN INSTRUMENT USED TO ASCERTAIN A
SCHOOL PRINCIPAL'S PATTERN OF BEHAVIOR

257
1

By
MORTON ALPREN

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

January, 1954

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is deeply indebted to Dr. Kimball Wiles for his aid in the design, execution, and presentation of this study. Recognition must be accorded to Dr. Vynce Hines for his continuous help as Coordinator of the Kellogg Leadership Study and to other members of the author's supervisory committee, Dr. Clara M. Olson, Dr. Pauline Hilliard, Dean J. B. White, and Dr. William G. Carleton for their encouragement and constructive suggestions which aided in the completion of this work.

Acknowledgements are accorded to Dr. R. L. Johns, Dr. Kate V. Wofford, Dr. Hal G. Lewis, Dr. Leon N. Henderson, Dr. Aleyné Haines, and the author's supervisory committee, all of whom served on the Research Staff of the Kellogg Leadership Study, for their guidance in the design of this study. Appreciation is extended to the student investigators on the research staff, who worked cooperatively with the author to secure data from the four schools studied intensively.

The author is grateful to Dr. Wiles, Dean White, and Dr. Joseph M. Leps for their signatures on letters used to obtain lengthy behavior descriptions from a national sample of school principals; to the principals and the staffs of the four schools studied intensively for the time and effort they generously supplied during an entire school year; and to all the principals who responded to and criticized the instrument.

To the University of Florida, for supplying a graduate fellowship grant, the author extends appreciation.

Finally, love, rather than gratitude, is expressed to Patricia F. Alpren for postponing other pursuits of interest so that her husband could attain this goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	THE PROBLEM	1
	The Problem of the University of Florida Study	1
	The Problem of This Study	3
	Related Research	6
	The Type of Instrument Sought	7
	Methods Employed in This Study	9✓
	The Sampling for the Intensive Study	13
	Limitations of the Study	14
	Definitions	15
II	DETERMINING THE SITUATIONS	17
	Overview	17
	Situations	18
	Development of Situations	26✓
	Summary	31
III	DETERMINING THE POSSIBLE BEHAVIORS	33
	Overview	33
	Construction of the Open-Ended Instrument	33
	Distribution and Analysis of the Open-Ended Instrument	35
	Development and Improvement of Preliminary Form of the Instrument	42
	Measuring the Extent of Discrimination	
	Power of Items	50
	Internal and External Validity	77✓
IV	THE CASE STUDIES	
	The Meaning of External Validity in This Study	78✓
	Purpose and Methods of Securing Case Study Evidence	78
	Case Study Criteria	80
	Application of the Case Studies	80
	The Case Studies	82
	Summary	169

Chapter	Page
V EXTERNAL VALIDITY	171
Overview	171
Criteria for Establishing Tests for Validity	172✓
Case Study-Principal Correspondence	183
Case Study-Teacher Correspondence	200
Teacher-Principal Correspondence and Composite Correspondence	214
Question Validity and Reducing the Size of the Instrument	225✓
Reliability	227✓
VI SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	244
Introduction	244
Summary of Findings	244
Recommendations for Administration of Instrument and Further Study	246
Implications for Use of Instrument	264
BIBLIOGRAPHY	268
APPENDICES	276
BIOGRAPHICAL ITEMS	360

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

The Problem of the University of Florida Study

In January, 1951, the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration was launched. With funds provided by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, and with the George Peabody College for Teachers acting as Program Center for the Southern States Region, a cooperative effort was begun toward the improvement of educational administration in the region. This effort included a study of the functions and competencies of the administrator, the functions of his professional association (American Association of School Administrators), the operation of state departments of education, and a comprehensive research design on educational administration.¹

The University of Florida, along with several other universities in the region, undertook one phase of the research. The purposes of the study at the University of Florida were (1) to develop ways of studying the operating patterns of school principals; (2) to categorize the operating patterns of school principals; (3) to study interrelationships of personality patterns of school principals and their operating

¹The Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, Creative Educational Leadership for a Changing Region, pp. 2-3, Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1953.

patterns; and (4) to determine the influence of various personality patterns and ways of working of school principals upon various aspects of school programs. As stated in the SSCPEA document:

The project at the University of Florida has as its purpose the study of relationships of leadership qualities (knowledge, intelligence, values, ways of working, and certain other personality qualities) of the school administrator to the human relations, pupil achievement, and program development in local situations. The major hypothesis relating to the study is that the qualities of the official leader's personality and his ways of working influence, to a major degree, the human relationships, pupil achievements, program development, holding power, and staff and pupil participation within a school.²

The University's attempts to utilize the human resources at its disposal resulted in the appointment of a coordinator for the study, the recruitment of a group of seven research assistants, the assignment of staff members to the project, and the use of outside consultants. The research team (coordinator and research assistants) devoted a full year to the study, and the research staff (research team and members of the university staff) met weekly to improve, continually, the design of the research. Consultants were brought into the meetings when needed.

An initial series of meetings took place in which the research staff outlined the year's work. It was decided that a major aim would be to develop an instrument capable of ascertaining the ways of working of a school principal. It was further agreed that, in order to fulfill

²Ibid., p. 26.

the needs of the project, instruments and methods would be developed and used to ascertain other aspects of the school program that related to the school principal's ways of working. Another decision resulted in plans to maintain research files of all data accumulated by individual research assistants for use by the entire research team.

The initial series of meetings succeeded in committing the University of Florida research staff to a three to five-year research project, the first phase of which was to develop the instruments and methods that would enable it to meet its purpose and test its major hypothesis.

The design of the study may be illustrated as follows:

Phase I - Development of Instruments

Leadership Practices	Leadership Attitudes and Values	Program Development	Teacher Activities
School-Community Relations	Pupil Human Relations	Teacher Human Relations	

Phase II - The Determination of Leadership Practices (Patterns of Behavior)

Phase III - Relationship of Leadership Practices To Phases of the School Program

The Problem of This Study

Seven investigators, each of whom assumed responsibility for developing the instruments needed to collect data necessary to

study one of the areas to be investigated, participated in the first phase of the University of Florida Study. The first area, Leadership Practices, was selected by this investigator and the problem of this study may be stated in terms of the following questions:

1. Can we identify the behaviors of a school principal?
2. Can an instrument be developed that elicits from the school principal responses which describe his actual behaviors?
3. Can an instrument be developed that will enable future investigators to determine a principal's behaviors in a relatively brief period of time?

The following assumptions were made:

1. The behavior manifested by a school principal may be observed, recorded, and categorized.
2. Numerous key situations exist in which a principal's behaviors are revealed.
3. The behaviors of school principals are divergent.
4. Certain patterns of behavior of school principals exist.
5. The principal, as the official leader of the school, is in a position to exert wider influence in the school than any other individual.
6. A group of impartial investigators, intensively studying the behaviors of a school principal, can ascertain

reality to a relatively high degree.

In the process of seeking answers to the major questions, it was necessary to explore the following specific problems:

1. What practices or behaviors are we seeking? Are we concerned with every activity in the daily life of a school principal? Where shall we look for the practices we are seeking?
2. Are we concerned with a limited number of behaviors or is there a need for an extensive study of principals who cannot be observed directly?
3. How can we be reasonably certain that the behaviors we discover are exhaustive?
4. What type of instrument or method can serve best to divulge the behaviors of school principals and do so in a relatively brief period of time?
5. Who shall respond to the instrument used for studying the behaviors of a school principal? Is the principal in a better position to perceive his behaviors than members of his faculty?
6. How can future investigators be aided in discovering and distinguishing between the behavior patterns of school principals?

Related Research

Very little research relating to the major problem of instrument development was available. Specifically, Seeman's³ study was the only one encountered in which an instrument was developed with a purpose of ascertaining an individual's behavior.

This study was similar to the writer's in that both dealt with devising instruments used to ascertain leadership behaviors of educators. Both focused upon four status leaders. Seeman studied the ways of working of the school superintendent. This study attempted to devise an instrument which would determine the working patterns of school principals.

In Seeman's⁴ study, four dimensions of behavior, based upon stated hypotheses, were employed. Change, communication, domination, and separatism represented dimensions (relationships) to be explored by behavior scaled instruments. Items were composed as a result of interviews conducted with school leaders and were assigned to dimension classification on a priori grounds.

The methodology in this study differs from Seeman's in that dimensions were not employed and tested but were to be arrived at by

³Melvin Seeman, "A Status Factor Approach to Leadership," Unpublished Report, Columbus, Ohio: Personnel Research Board, Ohio State University, 1950 (mimeographed).

⁴Ibid., pp. 5-8.

the empirical approach; it differs further to the extent that instrument development was not viewed in this study as one where items would be composed within the limitations of interviewing.

Other research of aid in furthering the progress of this study will be introduced where it pertains to the subject under discussion.

The Type of Instrument Sought

The goal of developing an instrument to be used to ascertain a school principal's behavior pattern raised such questions as:

1. How can we best learn of the behaviors of a school principal?
2. What type of instrument will perform this task most efficiently?

Ross⁵ has stated that the best means of measurement is a direct one and, if one wishes to learn how an individual behaves, he should seek this directly and not employ indirect means (e. g., measure attitudes or values).

In seeking the type of instrument that would most efficiently perform this task, the following possibilities were explored:

1. Shall the instrument be an oral interview or a written form?

On empirical grounds, it was decided that a written form was

⁵C. C. Ross, Measurement in Today's Schools, p. 76, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1947.

more expedient due to the fact that a future investigator would be unable to afford the time and expense of interviewing a large number of principals in the second year's phase of the University of Florida Study.

2. Shall the written form be an objective or essay (open-ended) type of instrument?

It was decided that the essay type, while desirable for the purpose of allowing the respondent freedom in describing his behavior, would be undesirable in other ways. Essay form responses would require much time to categorize and require interpretations on the part of both the respondent and the investigator. A well-prepared objective type of instrument could eliminate this problem.

3. What type of objective form will serve the purpose best?

The true-false type of form was rejected because it was believed that the behaviors that could be exhibited by all principals in any given situation were numerous. Attempts to phrase each question as a situation and a behavior for a true-false response would result in an exceedingly lengthy instrument.

The fill-in or completion types were rejected because of the problem of interpretation. Any open-ended type of response would require the judgments of an investigator and utilize much time for categorizing responses.

The multiple choice type of instrument was selected. It was felt that a presentation of each situation, followed by a group of all

possible behavior, would serve the purpose best. This form would save time and simplify the problem of interpretation for both the respondent and the investigator.

Methods Employed in the Study

At the initial meeting of the research staff, the decision was reached to seek behaviors by means of exploring selected key situations. Tyler's design for evaluating behavior was followed:

All methods of evaluating human behavior involve four technical problems: defining the behavior to be evaluated, determining the situations in which it is to be expressed, developing a record of the behavior which takes place in these situations, and evaluating the recorded behavior.⁶

The study consisted of four major phases: determining the key situations where the practices or behaviors of school principals would be revealed; discovering the kinds of behaviors existent in these situations; determining the reality of the behaviors of four school principals; and testing the instrument for validity.

The initial determination of key situations was accomplished by the thinking of a group of judges. The situations were analyzed and expanded by a class of graduate students, limited by a set of criteria acceptable to the research staff, tested with five school principals, examined during the stages of instrument development by the research

⁶Ralph W. Tyler, *Constructing Achievement Tests*, p. 92, Ohio State University: Bureau of Educational Research, 1934.

staff, and revised further in accordance with evidence furnished by respondents to the instrument as it was developed.

The possible behaviors existent in the situations were discovered through responses to the situations (presented as questions) from four cooperating principals and through responses from a larger sampling of ninety principals located in other sections of the state and nation. A listing of all possible responses was sought. All behaviors described by the principals who responded were included.

In order to test the responses to the instrument for validity it was necessary to determine the actual behaviors of respondents in the situations presented. This was achieved through an intensive study of four principals in their schools and communities by the research team. The investigators spent a major portion of the school year observing and recording the activities of the principals, teachers, pupils, and parents in their interactions with one another. In addition to observations, school personnel cooperated by submitting to interviews and responding to questionnaires about their activities and observations of the activities of others. Interviews were both non-directive and structured.⁷ Questionnaires employed were both open-ended

⁷A non-directive interview differs from a structured one in that the interviewee determines the content of discussion with the former technique; the questions are prepared prior to using the latter.

and directed.⁸ (During the initial period of the year's study the investigators concentrated most of their efforts on securing information about the principal's behavior. Their later efforts were directed toward their respective, individual goals. This resulted in a vast accumulation of data relating to the problem of this study.)

The research files, containing the information secured by all seven investigators in the four schools, provided a wealth of data for cross-checking the reliability of the behaviors of the principals. The investigator was able to categorize the information relating to the behaviors and secure ample evidence to attest to what constituted reality. The evidence presented as case studies in Chapter IV was utilized to establish the extent to which the principals and selected teachers were capable of responding accurately to the instrument after it was developed.

Reality, however, constituted but one aspect of validity. A second type of validity was sought by attempting to insure that respondents would be able to describe accurately their behaviors in each situation presented to them, i. e. Did the behaviors presented in each situation include all actions principals might take? Were principals able to distinguish between the behaviors described in each situation?

⁸Open-ended questionnaires permit respondents complete freedom in answering questions; the directed types limit respondents to one of a limited number of answers.

The second type of validity was established by two methods:

(1) securing descriptions of possible behaviors from a nation-wide sampling of principals and including all behaviors mentioned so that the list of responses would be exhaustive, (2) and administering the final instrument to a number of principals who were not previously involved to determine the distribution of their behaviors in each situation.

A third type of validity was that of testing the instrument in a school in which the research team had not worked. The four school-communities studied intensively were ones in which the research team had established rapport with personnel as its first step in the year's study. Due to the fact that the instrument was being developed for use in a second year's study with school personnel who would not be well known to investigators, it was believed necessary to determine the extent to which the instrument would be of use in a school-community administering situation in which rapport had not been established.

In a broad sense, the methods employed in the study revolved about three phases: the intensive study of the behaviors of four principals in four school-communities; the extensive study of the behaviors of ninety principals elsewhere in Florida and in other states in the nation; and, testing the results of data obtained in both phases for validity.

The Sampling for the Intensive Study

Six factors were considered in determining the sample for the intensive study. They were: length of employment of the principal, number of schools, school size, grade levels, community "type" and location, and faculty acceptance.

It was decided to study principals who had been employed in their schools for at least a two-year period. The inclusion of a new, or relatively new, principal would have introduced a variable factor which would interfere with the attempt to discern the extent of a principal's influence on school operation.

Only four schools were used. It was felt that, to increase the number beyond four, would adversely affect the accuracy of the information secured. Four schools of different types and sizes would provide an adequate test of validity of answers secured.

The considerations of sizes and types of schools led to the following selections:

1. Two schools included grades one through twelve. One possessed a student enrollment of 706, and the other 368.
2. A third school was a secondary school containing grades seven through twelve and possessed a student enrollment of eight hundred.
3. The fourth school was an elementary school terminating with a seventh grade and possessing an enrollment of 706.

The communities, from which the schools drew their students, were highly divergent. One was an area with a transient population near an urban center; a second was a rural, farm community; a third was located in a residential district near a university; and the fourth was a Negro community. The communities were located in three counties.

The last factor entering into the selection was school personnel's acceptance of the research team. Faculty members of the University's college of education either knew, personally, the school principal and members of his staff or had worked with them in a professional capacity. The research staff believed that the previous relationships would be an aid to the investigators in the pursuit of their tasks.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations were agreed upon:

1. The study of all principals was limited to that behavior exhibited in the interactions between principal and students, principal and teachers, and principal and community members most directly involved in the school program.

2. Due to the design of the University of Florida Study, a limitation was imposed on this study of making no attempt to discover or identify patterns of leadership beyond recommending methods by which discovery or identity could be accomplished. The process of

identifying behavior patterns would be included in the second year's phase when an investigator will determine the existent patterns after administering the instrument to a county-wide group of principals.

3. The research staff, in its desire to prevent value judgments from inhibiting the determination of behavior patterns, limited this study to deriving behaviors without ordering or scaling them. In the event that some scaling process should prove to be of need for the purpose of identifying behavior patterns in the second year's phase, it would be applied at that time. The design, at the time it emerged, called for using the results of the instruments developed by the other investigators as a means of evaluating the behavior patterns of school principals. This would be accomplished in the third year's phase of study.

Definitions

Some words or terms that may reveal meanings other than those intended in this writing are listed below:

Behavior. Any conduct, action, or practice exhibited by an individual.

Pattern of Behavior. The summation of the courses of action followed by an individual in selected situations.

Key situation. A situation involving the school principal wherein his behavior is thought to influence the human relations, pupil achievement, program development, community relations, and teacher

activities of the school.

Profile. A charted record of a principal's behavior in key situations.

Check List. A multiple choice type of questionnaire that presents a respondent with a group of possible answers to each question from which he can make a selection.

CHAPTER II

DETERMINING THE SITUATIONS

A. Overview

As discussed in the preceding chapter, Tyler's¹ approach to evaluating behavior was employed to help chart the design of this study. It is the purpose of this chapter to describe how the first two steps (defining the behavior and determining the situations in which it is to be expressed) were applied. Greater emphasis was placed upon the second step.

1. Defining the behavior.

The relationship between the definitions of behavior and key situations revealed that the behavior sought encompassed a school principal's conduct, action, or practices in those situations wherein human relations, pupil achievement, program development, community relations, and teacher activities were most likely to be influenced.

2. Determining the situations.

Key situations were determined by securing hypotheses concerning the decisive behavior of principals from authorities and checking them against the opinion of a graduate class in supervision,

¹Tyler, op. cit., p. 92.

descriptions of their behavior by ninety principals, and the intensive study of the behavior of four principals.

B. Situations

The initial attempt to arrive at a universe of key situations was the point at which this study assumed characteristics unique to the overall Kellogg Project at the University of Florida. A sub-committee of the research staff devised a tentative list of key situations pertaining to the principal and his ways of working with teachers, pupils, and community members. The investigator, as a member of the committee, was one of five to aid in the initial stage of this study. A reproduction of the essentials of the sub-committee report follows:

KELLOGG LEADERSHIP STUDY

Sub-Committee on "WAYS OF WORKING"

Key Situations

1. Teachers
 - a. forming the agenda for faculty meetings
 - b. teaching attendance checks
 - c. selection of new teachers
 - d. working with teachers having a difficulty
 - e. way principal participates in faculty meetings
 - f. decisions about policy and program change
 - g. work of teacher committees
 - 1) functions of committees

- 2) determining membership
- 3) working with a committee
- 4) treatment of committee reports
- 5) implementation of decisions
- 6) division of work
- 7) moment of decision

- h. rewards and punishments
- i. division of extra class activity
- j. schedule making
- k. budget making
- l. policy vs. expediency
- m. sharing information
 - 1) from superintendent
 - 2) from teacher groups
 - 3) routine announcements
- n. accessibility of principal to teachers
- o. treatment of teacher suggestions
- p. sharing office facilities and services
- q. censorship of teacher-pupil reports
- r. use of consultants

2. Pupils

- a. discipline
- b. planning with pupils
- c. participation of pupils

- d. making school facilities available
 - e. pupil-parent conference
 - f. pupil-teacher conference
 - g. pupil-pupil conference
 - h. rule establishment
 - i. treatment of pupil suggestions
 - j. personal relationship with pupils
3. Community
- a. relationships with P. T. A.
 - b. office staff attitude and orientation
 - c. treatment of parents whose children are in difficulty
 - d. community speeches
 - e. community participation and planning in school
 - f. community participation and planning out of school
 - g. parent-teacher-principal conferences
 - h. publicity releases
 - i. dealing with pressure groups
 - j. dealing with personal opposition
 - k. elections and issues

With this foundation, a supervision class at the University of Florida added key situations overlooked by the sub-committee. The class reviewed the tentative list and suggested the inclusion of the following:

1. Teachers
 - s. who the principal eats lunch with
 - t. class visitations
 - u. orientation of new teachers
 - v. dealing with teacher opposition
 - w. faculty splits
2. Pupils
 - k. participation by principal in pupil activities
 - l. use of student talent and labor
 - m. sending for pupils
3. Community
 - l. reporting to parents
 - m. social clique problems
 - n. use of school facilities
 - o. use of students in the community

This listing of situations was appraised and accepted by the research staff for initiating the study of the behaviors of each principal in the four schools. The listing was not conceived of as all-inclusive and considerable observation and informal interviewing were utilized in the intensive study of the schools, both preceding and superceding any structured attempts to secure information about the behaviors of principals.

The listing of situations served two purposes. It moved the study from observing generalities to observing specifics in the behaviors of principals. Furthermore, it formed the basis for developing a

structured interview which was used in the development of an instrument.

The situations were used by the research team to phrase fifty-seven questions. The following questions formed the basis of a structured interview with the four principals studied intensively:

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW (FORM A)

1. How is the agenda formed for faculty meetings? What do you do?
2. How do you know if a teacher is in the building? Where?
3. How are new teachers selected?
4. What do you do with a teacher who comes to you with a problem?
5. Do you have any specific techniques for discovering teacher difficulties? If so, do you try to do anything about these?
6. How do you participate in a faculty meeting?
7. How do you work with teacher committees?
8. Is there a well-recognized system of social control in your faculty?
How important are rewards and punishments in this system?
What is the principal's role in this system? How is meritorious achievement recognized?
9. How are teachers assigned extra class activity?
10. How is the school schedule formulated?
How is the school budget determined?
11. Do circumstances ever demand that you ignore established school

policy?

12. How do you disseminate information from:
 - a. Superintendent's office?
 - b. Teacher groups?
 - c. Your office?
13. In your own schedule, how do you make yourself accessible to teachers?
14. How do you treat teacher suggestions?
15. What use do you make of consultants?
16. How do you reconcile faculty conflicts?
17. What do you regard your social relationship with the faculty to be?
18. For what reasons do you visit the classroom?
19. How do you orientate new teachers?
20. How do you react to teacher opposition?
21. Who makes decisions about school policies?
22. Who makes decisions about program change?
23. How are functions of committees determined?
24. How is committee membership determined? Who decides who will be on what committee?
25. What is done with committee reports?
26. How are policies carried out?
27. When does a committee know that it is ready to make a decision?
28. What division of work is made in committees?

29. Can the principal edit, modify, or veto reports of teacher or pupil groups?
30. Who may use what office facilities and services?
31. What disciplinary procedures are used with pupils? What is the principal's responsibility?
32. Under what circumstances do pupils participate in planning? Does the principal ever plan with pupils?
33. What activities do the principal and pupils share?
34. What school facilities are available to pupils for non-class purposes? Who decides? Who has veto power?
35. Under what circumstances do you participate in pupil-parent conferences? Pupil-teacher conferences? Pupil-pupil conferences?
36. To what extent and how do you work with pupils in the establishment of rules?
37. How do you consider and deal with pupil suggestions?
38. What do you consider your role to be in your personal relationships with pupils?
39. What is your policy regarding visitation by former students of the school?
40. In your opinion, what should be the function of the P. T. A. ? To what extent do you participate in P. T. A. activities?
41. What part does the office staff play in community relations? How

do you prepare your staff for this?

42. What procedures are followed in working with parents whose children are in difficulty?
43. What is your policy regarding the acceptance of speech-making opportunities?
44. To what extent do you encourage community participation and planning in the school?
45. To what degree do you participate in community affairs?
46. Under what circumstances do you participate in parent-teacher conferences?
47. Who is responsible for the release of school publicity?
48. How do you deal with special interest groups who attempt to influence the school program?
49. How do you deal with personal opposition if it develops in the community?
50. To what extent do you participate in elections for persons? Issues?
51. Under what circumstances do you contact parents? By what means is this done?
52. How do you deal with social clubs that may exist in the school?
53. What school facilities are made available to the community?
54. How do students participate in community activities during school hours?
55. How, and under what circumstances, do you communicate with

the central office?

56. How do you protect teachers from outside pressures?

(cite examples)

57. What other questions might be asked?

C. Development of Situations

The following steps were taken to improve the presentation of the situations in Form A:

1. An analysis of the responses of the principals to the questions contained in the structured interview.
2. Group meetings of the research team resulting in suggestions for changes of, deletions of, or additions to the existing key situations. (The research team observed and participated in the interviewing process.)
3. An analysis, question by question, of the structured interview with the four principals in addition to a similar analysis with a fifth principal who was not involved in the study. (The principals were asked to discuss how they interpreted each question. Where their interpretations were at variance with the intent of the questions, they were asked to suggest changes in presentation.

This process of developing key situations was aided by the establishment of the following set of criteria:

1. Commonality. Does this situation present itself in all schools?
2. Frequency. Does this situation occur frequently enough to permit direct observation by researchers or allow for simple recall by individuals connected with the operation of a school?
3. Cruciality. Is this situation of such significance that it affects the operation of a school?
4. Variability of execution. Is this situation one whereby behaviors associated with it are likely to be distinguishable among principals?
5. Involvement of others. Does this situation involve the interaction of two or more people?
6. Clarity of intent. Is the intent clear in the presentation of this situation?
7. Expression of behavior. Does the presentation of this situation lend itself to an expression of behavior?

The analysis of responses from the four principals and criticisms by the research team and the principals consulted revealed the following examples of needs to improve the presentation of key situations (see Form A in Appendix A):

1. Some questions were not clear as to intent. (e.g., numbers 8, 28)
2. Some questions were not indices of behavior. (e.g., numbers 34, 40)
3. Some questions were almost certain to elicit similar types of

response from principals. (e. g., numbers 29, 39)

4. Some questions were not specific enough. (e. g., numbers 4, 42)

The critical process resulted in bringing about changes in the key situations. Some examples follow (cf. Forms A and B in Appendices A and B, respectively):

1. Number 8 (see Form A) proved difficult for principals to interpret. Two of the four principals completely misunderstood the purpose of the question. The separation and rephrasing of the situations achieved the desired effect (see Form B; Part I; 18, 19).
2. Number 40 (see Form A) provided two situations, one of which sought principal opinion rather than behavior. It was not important, for the purpose of this study, to secure the principal's views on P. T. A. functions. It was of significance to determine how he actually used his P. T. A. The desire to secure this information, in addition to determining his behavior regarding personal attendance at P. T. A. meetings, resulted in two situations, slightly altered in phraseology (see Form B; Part IV; 11, 12).
3. Number 29 (see Form A) was judged by the principals and research team as a question that might too easily be responded to by simple affirmative. All principals possess a legal power to veto reports from teacher and pupil groups. It was decided to

seek this behavior in a less direct manner by eliminating the word "veto" from situational context and treating teacher and pupil groups as separate entities (see Form B; Part II, 20; Part III, 13).

4. Number 4 (see Form A) was considered vague and overgeneralized by the principals. Each suggested that the type of behavior exhibited by a principal varied with the type of problem presented by an individual teacher. In order to isolate specific situations and the possible behaviors resulting, the research files were consulted. It was decided to present six situations dealing with recurrent individual teacher problems (see Form B; Part I; 4-9).

A third test of the key situations that should be included was secured by an analysis of the responses of ninety principals to Form B. The items were presented in an open-ended questionnaire. Analysis of the replies revealed the following changes should be made in Form B:

1. The combining of two questions where most principals responded with similar behaviors to each (see Form B; Part III; 11, 12). Almost all principals who responded² revealed the same behavior in their attempts to discover what their teachers are teaching and the methods that their teachers employ.
2. Deleting a question, the responses to which revealed behaviors too

²See Chapter III for the data pertaining to the sample of principals responding to Form B.

numerous for classification (see Form B; Part III; 16). The use of student talent or labor in school was not only interpreted differently by principals but, when understood, revealed too numerous a group of responses per principal for purposes of distinguishing future categories of possible behaviors.

3. Deleting a question that failed to elicit behavior responses (see Form B; Part IV; 9). The purposes of the principal in contacting parents dealt with motivation to the exclusion of the behavior.
4. Adding a question, the behaviors for which were revealed by extraneous responses to other questions. This was employed only where a review of the research files indicated that the new question represented a situation that satisfied the criteria (see Form C; 72).

One additional change of significance, in presenting the situations in the final form, was necessitated by the increased awareness, as the research progressed, that two situations bore little in the way of application to elementary schools (see Form C; 85, 86). Although exceptions may exist, problems involving future education and vocation as well as problems pertaining to student social cliques are rarely met in elementary schools. It was decided that in spite of the desire for a more uniform instrument it would be unrealistic to weigh these situations equally for both elementary and secondary school principals.

Therefore, they have been presented as situations to be responded to by school principals whose upper grades include the twelfth.

As a final appraisal of situations presented in the final form, two additional criteria were applied:

1. The phrasing of each question must be such as to eliminate or minimize the onus of "good" or "bad" or signify that the researcher placed value judgments on responses.

2. Each question must approach a specific type of situation while attempting to maintain the identity of general or "most usual" behavior in that situation. The purpose of specificity was to aid the respondent; general behavior purpose was to prevent the loss of identity of the key situation.

Form C, the third revision of the key situations, hypothesized and tested against the behaviors of four principals and the written responses of ninety principals became the basis of the final instrument.

D. Summary

It may be seen from an examination of the preliminary and final forms, that the number of key situations was not constant. The presentation of situations in each of the forms -- fifty-seven in "A," 121 in "B," and eighty-six in "C" (see Forms A, B, and C in Appendices A, B, and C, respectively) -- were devised and altered upon bases described

in this chapter.

The result, in effect, has been an effort to arrive at a universe of key situations involving a school principal and those with whom he interacts. A more elaborate discussion of the empirical approach employed in the development of the instrument is presented in the chapter to follow.

CHAPTER III

DETERMINING THE POSSIBLE BEHAVIORS

A. Overview

The first phase of instrument construction, viz., determining the situations to be presented, was discussed in Chapter II. The second phase of construction, viz., determining the possible responses, will be discussed in this chapter.

Two goals were sought in determining the possible responses: to procure an exhaustive group of behaviors for each situation, and to prepare a set of responses to each key situation which would distinguish among the individuals marking each key situation.

The instrument was developed in three steps, viz., a structured interview, an open-ended questionnaire, and a check list (cf. Forms A, B, and C in Appendices A, B, and C, respectively). The previous chapter explained the construction of the structured interview and its transition toward the open-ended questionnaire. This chapter will explain more about the construction of the questionnaire and its transition toward the check list.

B. Construction of the Open-Ended Questionnaire

The structured interview was designed, primarily, to help determine and develop the key situations. The responses to this form,

however, revealed the behaviors of a few principals. In order to develop a check list that any principal could respond to, it was necessary to determine the universe of behaviors that applied to each of the key situations. In order to secure descriptions of these behaviors it was necessary to depart from the local, intensive phase of the study. To accomplish this, the investigator, with the aid of the structured interview, the research file data of the four schools under study, and selected personnel at the University of Florida, proceeded to develop an open-ended instrument, (Form B) to be distributed to school principals on a larger scale. The situations (questions) used were discussed in Chapter II.

The medium of communication for the open-ended form differed from that of the interview. In the interview, the problems of the intent of the questions and interpretive variation of respondents were met by oral exchange between interviewer and interviewee. No such communication could be established through a mailed questionnaire. The problem was met by an analysis of the responses from the principals who were interviewed.

The analysis revealed that the most common problem was due to an onus of expected "correct," "ideal," or "textbook" answers. To overcome this, the writer, his chairman, and the research coordinator agreed upon the need to reword each question so as to focus on personal and/or specific responses. Some samples of rewordings follow:

- (a) The question, "How are new teachers selected?", was not as personally directed as it might have been. It was changed to, "What is your procedure in the selection of a new teacher?" (cf. Form A, 3 and Form B, Part I, 1).
- (b) The question, "What do you regard your social relationship with the faculty to be?", did not encourage a response attesting to the degree of in-group relationships experienced between a principal and his teachers in his performance of duties. The attempt at making the question more specific resulted in a rewording to, "Where do you draw the line on personal-social relationships during the school day?" (cf. Form A, 17 and Form B, Part II, 6).
- (c) The most frequent type of rewording involved such prefaces as, "How do you ---?" and "What do you do ---?" where former questions indicated evasive or over-generalized behavior responses (see Form B).

C. Distribution and Analysis of Open-Ended Questionnaire

1. The sub-forms and sampling distribution

A review of the answers the four principals gave concerning their interactions with teachers, pupils, and parents revealed that a principal's relationships with the first named group could be viewed in two ways, viz., his behavior relating to teachers as individuals and his behavior

relating to teachers as groups. This resulted in the investigator's decision to sub-divide the area of principal-teacher relationships. The sub-division, while one that might have been applicable to relationships with pupils and parents, was observed to be less pronounced in these areas. Hence, Form B (see Appendix B) was sub-divided into four parts, viz., with individual teachers, with teachers as groups, with students, and with community members. These will, hereafter, be referred to as the sub-forms, Part I, II, III, IV, respectively.

Prior to distributing the open-ended form, all questions were reviewed by two former principals (currently staff members of the University), the coordinator of the research project, a secondary school dean, a secondary school teacher, and an elementary school teacher. All were in agreement that the questions would be understood by principals asked to respond to the questions. The instrument was reviewed also by participating Kellogg Leadership staff members of the Southeastern Conference.

Because of the length of the form, it was realized that it would be difficult to secure an adequate number of returns. The solution of this problem was to ask each principal to answer the questions dealing with one area (e. g. , sub-form Part I). The samplings were distributed as follows:

- a. Thirty-eight were mailed to principals who are members of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Twelve

states and all areas of the United States, with the exception of the North-eastern Region, were represented.

b. Ninety-three were mailed to principals in South Carolina. A state handbook was utilized for the selection and numerically spaced names were used as the basis for random sampling. Deviations from the numerically spaced names were employed to secure the names of twenty-six Negro principals. Deviations were also employed to secure a distribution to forty-two secondary principals, twenty-three elementary principals, and twenty-eight principals of schools containing both grade levels. Precautions were taken to include principals from every county, principals of small and large schools, and to exclude principals with faculties consisting of less than seven staff members. (The number was arrived at arbitrarily, and the restriction was set due to the fact that numerous situations in Part II of Form B involved working with faculty groups.)

c. Ninety were mailed to principals in Florida. The same procedure in selection was employed as with the South Carolina principals.

d. Seven were mailed to principals in four states by the writer.

In each of the four distributions mentioned above, an equal number of each of the four sub-forms of Form B were randomly selected (e. g. twenty-five per cent of the forms sent to Florida and an equal

per cent sent to South Carolina pertained to the principal's relations with students (see Form B, Part III).

The returns to the open-ended questionnaire revealed the following representations:

a. Twenty responded to Part I, twenty-two responded to Part II, twenty-seven responded to Part III, and twenty-one responded to Part IV. This resulted in a total of ninety returns from 228 forms distributed, or a return of 39.9%. (The research files contained most of the behaviors of the four principals in the 121 situations. In effect, this provided four additional returns for each of the four sub-forms of the instrument. This evidence appears in Chapter IV.)

b. Although respondents were not required to reveal their identities, most of them did (81 or 90.0%), and the postmarks on the envelopes of the remaining respondents revealed the geographical representation of returns. Consistent with the distribution, most returns for each of the sub-forms were representative of Florida and South Carolina. Part I returns were secured from seven states; Part II, from seven states; Part III, from nine states; and Part IV, from five states.

c. Because of the vague notions of responding principals as to the sizes of community populations served by their schools, (see initial data requests in Form B, Appendix B), it was impossible to determine the representation of community size from the returns. The

fact that ten respondents failed to signify their identities, and that some of these were in localities where forms were sent to both Negro and white schools, prevents the researcher from presenting accurate accounts of the sources of all returns. However, on the basis of discernable evidence, it is possible to state that some representation from both Negro and white schools, as well as small and large community populations, was obtained.

d. The returns by grade, student enrollment, and staff size is presented in Table I. The evidence reveals that distributions were satisfactory.

2. Treatment and Refinement of Responses

The returns to the open-ended questionnaire were analyzed and it was revealed that the number was adequate for the intended purpose. It was observed in recording the responses from the ninety principals that, after receiving about fifteen returns to each of the four sub-forms (e. g., Principal's Behavior Relating to Individual Teachers), future returns almost completely overlapped the content of earlier ones. Whereas ninety returns were acknowledged (see Table I), an additional seven were received. None of the unrecorded returns furnished added information about the behavior of principals.

The responses to each situation by the ninety principals were treated in two distinct steps. The steps were:

TABLE I

REPRESENTATION OF RETURNS TO FORM B BY GRADES, STUDENT ENROLLMENT, AND SIZE OF STAFF

Sub-Form	School Grades Contained*				Student Enrollment				Size of Staff			
	3	6	9	12	Under 300	300-749	750-1000	Over 1000	7-15	16-30	31-50	Over 50
I	10	11	13	10	2	10	3	5	3	11	4	2
II	11	11	14	14	3	11	5	3	3	10	7	2
III	14	15	20	14	2	12	7	6	2	10	13	2
IV	13	12	12	12	1	9	2	9	2	8	6	5
Totals	47	48	59	50	8	42	17	23	10	39	30	11

*Indicates that specified grade is part of total grades in the school. Schools containing twelve grades are represented in 3, 6, 9 and 12.

- a. an abbreviated recording of the responses to each of the 121 situations which resulted in 121 groupings of behaviors,¹ and
- b. analysis to differentiate behaviors within each grouping and avoid restatements.

During the process of analysis of behavior groupings, each was subjected to the following criteria:

- a. Responses must relate to principal behavior. Exceptions must be indicative of a lack of behavior as "don't have one" in reference to P. T. A. activities (see Form C, Question 2, Item d) or a referral for action to others (see Question 13, Item h).
- b. Responses must be distinguishable within each grouping so that respondents are offered a clear choice. The original grouping of responses relating to the principal's behavior after observing a class included "nothing at the time; arrange for a later conference with the teacher." It was decided that this behavior was too similar to others (see Question 72, Items b, d, e) and was thereby provided for elsewhere.

¹The term behavior grouping is used in reference to all the behaviors that apply to any given, single question or situation.

- c. Responses must not be too lengthy. The realization that responding to the form was a time consuming operation, dictated a need for brevity. Where meaning could be maintained, statements were shortened so as to prevent fatigue on the part of the respondents.
- d. Responses must not be arranged in an order that might reveal value judgments. Hence, while certain groupings were arranged with a purpose of lessening the respondents' consumption of time (see arrangement of Question 10), no other arrangements of behavior groupings were made.
- e. Responses must not convey a "good" or "bad" connotation. Hence, precautions were made to limit the use of adverbs and adjectives in refining the wordings.
- f. Responses must not contain more than two variables, i. e., a response must contain no more than two elements of behavior. For example, a principal, in selecting a new teacher, may turn to a personal contact from a university for applicants; interview all who apply; include his staff's opinion in making the selections; and, as his basis for making the final decision, weigh such factors as experience and appearance. Four distinct variables must be dealt with in listing such behaviors for multiple response selection. These variables, viz., source of applications, basis of

selection, selection decision, and basis for decision, all appeared in the returns to the open-ended instrument but, if provided for in the final form, would have necessitated so many combinations of possibilities that the final instrument would have been of unmanageable size. Hence, the investigator, with the approval of the research staff, decided to limit all behavior groupings to two variables. In the example discussed, basis for decision and selection decision were the variables selected (see Appendix, Form C, Question 61).

D. Development and Improvement of Preliminary Form of the Instrument

Further measures were taken to insure that a universe of behaviors would be provided. Four resources were utilized to secure additional responses: case studies of the four principals studied intensively; teachers in the four schools; university personnel and graduate students; and twenty-eight principals in schools within a reasonable radius of the university.

The case studies of the four principals (see Chapter IV) revealed some behaviors different from those provided in returns to the questionnaire. One principal referred many problem situations to an assistant.

By using Form B as a structured interview with teachers in the

four schools, the investigator was able to procure "new" behaviors. While some of these behaviors were not those most frequently employed by their principals, the information provided evidence of the existence of additional behaviors.

In addition to seeking the universe of behaviors, situations and behaviors were rearranged to ease the task of the respondent. The basis for arranging the order of the situations was that of a subject index. Student behavior problems, faculty meetings, committee work, community participation, etc., were the subjects used by the investigator as the basis for arranging the order of the questions in the final form. This lessened the respondent's problem of having to reorient his thinking for every question.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, a deliberate arrangement of behaviors was provided only where a behavior grouping was lengthy and a few behaviors had one variable in common. The purpose of arranging them was to ease the respondent's task (see Form C, Questions 9 and 10). This procedure was followed by scrutiny and minor revisions of both situations and behaviors for purposes of presenting clear phrasing and grammatical consistency.

The long range objective of the application of the instrument, viz., the obtaining of profiles that would reveal differing patterns of behaviors of principals, dictated two decisions at this stage of instrument development. The problems leading to these decisions may be

viewed in terms of two questions:

1. In what manner shall principals be instructed to respond to the situations?
2. If no values or "correctness" are to be associated with the instrument, can some continuum or scale be devised for each of the behavior groupings for purposes of analyzing responses?

The first problem involved an option of methods of response.

The respondent might be instructed to:

1. place a single check mark adjacent to the response most typical of his behavior in the given situation.
2. place a single check mark adjacent to his most typical behavior and a double check mark adjacent to his ideal behavior.
3. signify by percentages (to total one hundred) the behaviors that apply and thereby respond to any number in a single grouping.
4. signify by rank priority (e. g. , 1, 2, 3...) the responses most typical of his behavior and place "N" adjacent to behaviors he never employs.
5. signify by unrestricted, rank priority (see Form C, last example, following the instructions) the responses most

typical of his behavior and thereby be permitted greater freedom in "describing" his behavior.

The decision as to which of the options to employ was dependent upon the following factors:

1. the element of the reality of a single choice of behavior in each situation; this concern related to the achievement of a high degree of external validity of the instrument.
2. the analysis and treatment of responses; this concern related to the method of testing for external validity of the instrument.
3. the translation of responses to profiles for the interpretation of patterns of behavior; this concern related to the application of the instrument in the second phase of the University of Florida Study and problems of future investigators.

The three factors could not be dealt with separately as the decision would affect all three. A solution that would further two of the above factors would not serve to forward the third one and the investigator, with the aid of the thinking of the research staff, decided that the most important factor in the decision was that of securing reality from respondents as to their behavior.

Considerations of importance in this decision: (1) element of reality in principal "forced" responses, (2) the analysis and treatment

of the responses for validity testing, and (3) the translation of responses to profiles for the interpretation of patterns of behavior. These considerations could not be easily divorced from one another. (Yet a research product may depend upon sacrifice at a decisive point whereby "one cannot have his cake and eat it, too.") In essence, the decision was one of determining whether to choose reality and logical principal behavior response, thereby sacrificing conventional methods of analysis and treatment, or strive for achievement of the latter at the expense of the former.

The year's intensive study of the behaviors of the four principals revealed that all but the third and fifth options (percentages and unrestricted priority) were unreal and would inhibit responses from principals. Many situations were met by principals with two behaviors, equally utilized, and to force a single response might have compelled the respondent to seek the "good" one. The implied assumption was that maximum freedom to respond encouraged a maximum authenticity. Restriction of response encouraged "preferred" responses. The research files contained much evidence to support the fact that principals revealed their behaviors in proportion to the opportunity afforded them to do so. The research files also revealed that principals frequently utilized multiple behaviors in response to numerous situations. Percentages would complicate scoring and analysis without furthering the objective. Hence, unrestricted rank priority was decided upon as the

method for respondents to utilize.

The decisions effect upon treatment and analysis of responses may be gleaned from Chapter IV. The problem of profile presentation is associated with a second decision -- that based upon the use of a scale for each behavior grouping.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, one of the criteria used in developing the instrument called for eliminating the use of any arrangement of behaviors (other than grouping behaviors having a variable in common so as to ease the respondent's task). This affected the plan to utilize profiles in the first year's phase of study. Without any ordered arrangement of behaviors, two highly divergent patterns might well appear to be almost similar on a profile. By the same token, two principals with somewhat similar ways of working might appear, on such a profile, to have highly divergent practices.

A decision was reached that this study would forward hypotheses of dimensions revealed by the instrument (see Chapter VI). These dimensions could be studied and acted upon by future investigators and used as bases for scaling the behaviors. After this process, profiles would reveal the behavior patterns of principals.

By these steps, the preliminary form was devised. Additional steps were employed to help improve the instrument.

The first of these steps was to use two groups of principals for seminar sessions to scrutinize the instrument. The group focus

in each case was directed toward three elements of appraisal: behaviors omitted for a universe in each grouping, similar behaviors within each grouping, and clarity of each situation and behavior.

Members of the research team evaluated the form to discover the omission of behaviors known to exist from their experiences.

For purposes of seeking the extent to which behaviors distinguished among principals, twenty-eight principals responded to the instrument. These principals were asked to criticize it in the same manner as those who participated in the seminars. Teachers in the four school of intensive study were requested to make critical appraisals of the instrument. As a result of these evaluations, revisions were introduced. Some examples follow:

1. A few instances were noted where a specific practice was not provided for in a behavior grouping. One principal revealed that when a teacher referred a pupil to him due to misbehavior, he delegated the responsibility for the decision to a student court (see Form C, Question 14, Item k). Another such instance arose when a principal's method of assigning teachers to non-class duties was one of employing an alphabetical rotation (see Question 31, Item m).
2. The evaluations revealed that by altering a single word in the phrasing of a behavior, that item gained or lost value

for a respondent. A pronounced example was furnished in the situation dealing with repeated pupil misbehaviors (see Question 17, Item h). The intent of the response dealing with depriving a pupil of all his privileges was not lost by eliminating the word "all." Respondents believed, however, that its inclusion prevented some from acknowledging it as their course of action in the situation.

3. A few examples were revealed where elements other than actual behavior were present. In the situation dealing with the future education or vocation of a pupil (see Question 85, Item h), one behavior of principals was listed as "little need for such conferences as these decisions belong in the home." There was no need for the opinion expressed by the last part of the phrase and such inclusion was inconsistent with the intent of dealing only with direct behavior (see Chapter I). The entire response was deleted since the behavior, sans the opinion, had already been provided for in the behavior grouping.

With these revisions, the final form of the instrument was completed. It was not until this stage of the research that the four principals intensively studied during the year were requested to respond to the

Principal Behavior Check List.²E. Measuring the Extent of Discrimination Power of Items

1. The Sampling

To test whether the test items discriminate among principals, the instrument was administered to twenty-eight school principals in Florida.

The sample was random with a limited geographical area. The researcher was able to secure eleven respondents from University of Florida classes; ten from principals representing two counties in the local area; four from the schools studied intensively; and three from personal contacts. The twenty-eight principals represented seven counties in the northern region of Florida.

The twenty-eight respondents represented an equal division of principals from elementary and secondary schools. Only one, however, represented the behavior of a principal in a school with a student enrollment as high as one thousand, most principals working in schools of enrollments within a range of from three to eight hundred students.

It is highly questionable that the number and quality of the

²The term check list is utilized, in spite of the decision to request priority responses, due to the fact that first priorities were utilized as the basis of validity testing (see Chapter V) and is recommended as the basis for profile recording in the future.

TABLE II

BEHAVIOR RESPONSE DISTRIBUTION AMONG TWENTY-EIGHT PRINCIPALS

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
1	a	4	21	2	a	0	2
	b	1	3		b	0	0
	c	5	29		c	11	52
	d	1	5		d	1	5
	e	3	14		e	0	0
	f	1	11		f	8	39
	g	2	11		g	1	17
	h	1	11		h	7	35
	i	1	11				
	j	1	3				
	k	3	17				
	l	5	33				
	Total	28	167			28	115
3	a	3	13	4	a	1	9
	b	5	32		b	6	23
	c	0	2		c	4	19
	d	9	43		d	1	8
	e	6	36		e	3	20
	f	0	8		f	4	18
	g	2	7		g	3	24
	h	3	19		h	6	26
					i	0	0
					j	0	8
	Total	28	160			28	155

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
5	a	6	28	6	a	0	6
	b	2	16		b	2	9
	c	2	19		c	10	46
	d	4	21		d	6	35
	e	0	3		e	5	28
	f	3	14		f	1	26
	g	1	6		g	4	16
	h	0	0				
	i	5	17				
	j	1	7				
	k	1	3				
	l	3	14				
Total		28	104			28	166
7	a	2	10	8	a	7	31
	b	2	13		b	1	10
	c	1	5		c	0	8
	d	1	8		d	5	19
	e	2	15		e	4	26
	f	0	0		f	2	20
	g	0	0		g	4	25
	h	0	4		h	4	18
	i	9	41		i	1	8
	j	10	47		j	0	3
	k	1	7				
		28	150			28	168
Total							

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
9	a	5	24	10	a	0	2
	b	0	4		b	0	3
	c	6	35		c	0	6
	d	9	46		d	3	16
	e	5	25		e	0	1
	f	3	26		f	2	8
	g	0	4		g	3	15
	h	0	0		h	7	22
					i	4	16
					j	5	25
					k	1	11
					l	1	12
					m	2	7
					n	0	2
					o	0	2
Total		28	104			28	178
11	a	0	0	12	a	8	36
	b	1	6		b	3	20
	c	4	14		c	1	10
	d	11	54		d	2	12
	e	1	12		e	6	28
	f	8	45		f	0	0
	g	1	15		g	0	1
					h	1	11
					i	0	6
					j	5	20
Total		26	116			26	144

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
13	a b c d e f g h i	9 4 6 7 1 0 0 1 0	39 29 39 27 16 1 3 7 3	14	a b c d e f g h i j k l m	6 2 1 0 5 7 1 3 0 0 0 2 1	32 25 9 1 30 31 6 16 6 0 1 6 h
Total		28	161			28	167
15	a b c d e f g h	11 3 10 1 0 0 0 3	52 23 43 11 3 1 0 16	16	a b c d e f g h i j k l	4 1 7 7 5 4 2 0 1 0 0 2 1	21 20 26 30 25 14 1 4 2 1 1 5 5
Total		28	119			27	158

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
17	a	0	1	18	a	15	56
	b	0	9		b	1	10
	c	5	28		c	4	22
	d	0	1		d	1	8
	e	13	45		e	0	1
	f	4	26		f	0	2
	g	1	21		g	0	0
	h	5	27		h	1	10
	i	0	1		i	4	24
					j	0	3
					k	0	10
					l	0	9
					m	2	7
					n	0	5
Total		28	159			28	167
19	a	5	21	20	a	10	30
	b	9	42		b	9	27
	c	3	16		c	6	18
	d	0	4		d	3	9
	e	1	7		e	0	0
	f	0	2				
	g	3	24				
	h	1	7				
	i	2	15				
	j	2	10				
	k	1	3				
	l	1	9				
Total		27	160			28	84

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total Behavior Responses
21	a	0	3	22	a	0	3
	b	0	2		b	0	0
	c	4	16		c	1	5
	d	4	18		d	8	25
	e	5	22		e	0	0
	f	0	2		f	1	8
	g	13	19		g	2	13
	h	2	17		h	3	20
					i	2	15
					j	4	27
					k	8	39
						28	155
Total		28	129				
23	a	4	22	24	a	2	8
	b	7	11		b	0	4
	c	2	15		c	0	1
	d	7	26		d	2	9
	e	3	26		e	14	52
	f	5	32		f	3	32
					g	5	33
					h	2	12
Total		28	162			28	151

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total Behavior Responses
25	a	4	26	26	a	7	30
	b	3	14		b	0	6
	c	1	8		c	4	18
	d	16	56		d	7	35
	e	2	19		e	1	12
	f	2	22		f	3	23
Total		28	147		g	5	18
						27	144
27	a	1	10	28	a	0	3
	b	10	49		b	2	12
	c	9	40		c	2	19
	d	5	29		d	14	53
	e	2	13		e	2	11
	f	1	3		f	5	33
Total		28	141		g	3	15
						0	0
						28	146

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
29	a	0	9	30	a	2	14
	b	0	10		b	0	1
	c	2	23		c	1	8
	d	1	11		d	5	33
	e	0	0		e	5	17
	f	2	8		f	6	43
	g	1	6		g	9	39
	h	0	3				
	i	10	37				
	j	12	46				
Total		28	153			28	155
							57
31	a	8	37	32	a	0	5
	b	4	23		b	8	38
	c	0	6		c	14	59
	d	2	9		d	1	15
	e	1	10		e	3	21
	f	4	25		f	0	3
	g	3	14		g	2	17
	h	0	0		h	0	1
	i	0	4				
	j	0	2				
	k	4	19				
	l	1	11				
	m	1	3				
Total		28	163			28	159

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
33	a	0	0	34	a	3	13
	b	0	0		b	1	3
	c	9	37		c	1	5
	d	1	8		d	9	44
	e	0	2		e	4	25
	f	0	1		f	3	22
	g	0	3		g	1	9
	h	8	36		h	1	8
	i	0	8		i	1	12
	j	7	35		j	0	3
	k	0	0		k	4	15
	l	2	14				
	m	1	8				
Total		28	155			28	159
35	a	0	2	36	a	0	0
	b	0	1		b	1	6
	c	3	12		c	2	15
	d	3	20		d	8	43
	e	11	53		e	12	57
	f	4	20		f	3	17
	g	7	39		g	2	7
Total		28	117			28	115

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
37	a	7	39	38	a	1	9
	b	0	4		b	1	9
	c	1	14		c	7	33
	d	11	52		d	3	13
	e	7	41		e	10	49
	f	1	3		f	2	14
					g	3	32
					h	1	5
					i	0	1
					j	0	2
Total		27	153			28	167
39	a	3	13	40	a	2	7
	b	6	34		b	4	18
	c	0	1		c	6	35
	d	2	11		d	0	0
	e	12	50		e	9	54
	f	0	6		f	5	38
	g	2	10		g	2	14
	h	0	2				
	i	3	19				
	j	0	5				
Total		27	151			28	166

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
41	a	3	18	42	a	6	36
	b	4	19		b	8	34
	c	0	1		c	2	17
	d	1	9		d	6	30
	e	2	19		e	2	16
	f	5	22		f	0	0
	g	1	11		g	0	2
	h	1	5		h	0	5
	i	6	38		i	3	22
	j	0	10		j	1	6
	k	5	16			28	168
Total		28	168				
43	a	0	6	44	a	1	4
	b	1	11		b	6	34
	c	2	13		c	3	12
	d	3	16		d	0	4
	e	1	12		e	9	41
	f	8	38		f	2	22
	g	11	53		g	0	3
	h	1	7		h	6	30
	i	0	0				
	j	0	4			27	150
	k	1	7				
Total		28	167				

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total Behavior Responses
45	a	0	0	46	a	0	1
	b	0	4		b	0	4
	c	2	14		c	2	18
	d	5	35		d	4	16
	e	3	10		e	0	11
	f	2	16		f	8	37
	g	2	11		g	0	3
	h	1	14		h	1	5
	i	0	1		i	13	53
	j	0	1		j	0	13
	k	0	34		k	0	5
	l	1	6		l	0	2
	m	1	9				
Total		27	145			28	168
47	a	15	54	48	a	5	15
	b	1	5		b	2	22
	c	0	7		c	3	22
	d	2	16		d	2	10
	e	0	13		e	4	22
	f	1	3		f	3	21
	g	0	8		g	2	8
	h	6	25		h	4	25
	i	0	7		i	0	2
	j	0	10		j	3	17
	k	3	14				
Total		28	162			28	164

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
49	a	8	26	50	a	6	19
	b	3	26		b	3	21
	c	3	19		c	1	22
	d	4	24		d	3	9
	e	3	18		e	2	12
	f	2	9		f	9	38
	g	4	21		g	2	23
	h	1	9		h	2	16
Total		28	152			28	160
51	a	3	13	52	a	11	54
	b	1	20		b	9	34
	c	3	24		c	3	23
	d	11	41		d	3	22
	e	1	15		e	2	8
	f	9	46				
	g	0	1				
Total		28	160			28	141

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total Behavior Responses
53	a	2	12
	b	8	31
	c	1	11
	d	1	8
	e	5	28
	f	2	16
	g	5	26
	h	0	2
	i	0	3
	j	0	6
	k	4	25
Total		28	168
55	a	5	29
	b	5	30
	c	1	11
	d	4	24
	e	0	3
	f	5	22
	g	8	24
Total		28	163
54	a	2	16
	b	17	64
	c	1	16
	d	0	0
	e	0	0
	f	0	1
	g	3	30
	h	1	10
	i	4	26
Total		28	163
56	a	1	3
	b	3	9
	c	3	14
	d	12	60
	e	2	18
	f	5	47
	g	1	13
	h	1	5
	i	0	0
Total		28	159

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
57	a	7	29	58	a	2	9
	b	0	2		b	4	33
	c	7	36		c	5	26
	d	8	32		d	1	4
	e	4	22		e	7	34
	f	1	16		f	5	18
	g	1	14		g	4	25
Total		28	151			28	149
59	a	1	6	60	a	3	13
	b	4	19		b	1	7
	c	1	7		c	10	49
	d	0	8		d	1	9
	e	10	45		e	6	35
	f	0	3		f	3	28
	g	2	11		g	4	18
	h	3	23				
	i	4	22				
	j	2	17				
	k	1	3				
		28	161			28	161
Total							

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
61	a	8	36	62	a	4	18
	b	2	17		b	2	13
	c	0	0		c	4	24
	d	9	43		d	0	5
	e	1	15		e	1	7
	f	3	21		f	2	9
	g	0	5		g	4	20
	h	5	27		h	1	7
	i	0	0		i	6	33
					j	2	6
Total		28	151		k	2	16
						28	158
63	a	2	25	64	a	1	13
	b	4	16		b	9	42
	c	0	3		c	4	25
	d	0	2		d	2	9
	e	4	24		e	1	3
	f	4	23		f	1	9
	g	13	56		g	10	41
	h	1	8				
		28	157			28	142

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
65	a	2	29	66	a	5	28
	b	0	2		b	2	9
	c	0	1		c	5	30
	d	6	37		d	3	17
	e	16	63		e	1	8
	f	3	23		f	1	3
					g	3	19
					h	2	18
					i	6	36
Total		27	155			28	168
67	a	1	5	68	a	4	24
	b	1	15		b	2	16
	c	0	0		c	0	0
	d	3	10		d	2	6
	e	5	28		e	6	34
	f	2	21		f	7	36
	g	2	8		g	3	21
	h	2	12		h	1	6
	i	3	20		i	3	22
	j	8	37				
Total		27	156			28	165

TABLE II (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total Behavior Responses
69	a	2	12	70	a	0	9
	b	3	17		b	0	4
	c	7	39		c	7	37
	d	6	32		d	7	41
	e	0	4		e	2	13
	f	5	24		f	0	0
	g	1	5		g	3	12
	h	0	6		h	9	47
	i	0	0				
	j	2	10				
	k	0	1				
	l	1	7				
	m	1	10				
Total		28	167			28	163
71	a	0	0	72	a	3	16
	b	3	16		b	2	15
	c	7	38		c	0	3
	d	1	3		d	5	27
	e	5	35		e	11	49
	f	6	29		f	3	13
	g	1	6		g	0	8
	h	1	0		h	0	2
	i	1	14		i	2	11
	j	1	11		j	1	6
	k	2	7		k	1	3
	l	1	5				
Total		28	164			28	153

TABLE II (continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Responses	Total# Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Responses	Total# Behavior Responses
73	a	4	24	74	a	0	0
	b	2	17		b	1	3
	c	1	5		c	2	8
	d	2	11		d	1	5
	e	3	21		e	1	5
	f	4	16		f	3	11
	g	0	4		g	0	1
	h	2	19		h	0	4
	i	0	9		i	8	36
	j	10	41		j	11	40
	Total	28	167			27	103
75	a	0	0	76	a	0	4
	b	0	3		b	1	10
	c	5	28		c	0	1
	d	0	2		d	1	6
	e	13	51		e	2	7
	f	7	38		f	0	1
	g	0	13		g	4	25
	h	0	8		h	0	0
	i	0	0		i	0	6
	j	0	6		j	0	4
	k	1	5		k	6	33
	Total	26	154		l	13	52
						27	149

TABLE 11 (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
77	a	2	6	78	a	1	5
	b	2	15		b	8	33
	c	3	19		c	4	22
	d	1	15		d	4	16
	e	11	45		e	2	10
	f	5	25		f	4	19
	g	1	4		g	0	6
	h	1	5		h	0	0
	i	1	4		i	1	5
					j	3	12
					k	0	4
Total		27	138			27	132
79	a	0	3	80	a	1	3
	b	0	3		b	7	35
	c	5	24		c	1	9
	d	2	17		d	1	17
	e	8	34		e	4	24
	f	2	16		f	1	5
	g	1	3		g	2	6
	h	6	25		h	10	53
	i	0	0		i	0	1
	j	2	8			27	153
		26	133				
Total							

TABLE 11 (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
81	a	8	37	82	a	0	4
	b	0	8		b	6	30
	c	13	55		c	2	13
	d	2	8		d	0	0
	e	4	17		e	0	8
Total				83	f	0	1
					g	1	9
					h	2	8
					i	1	5
					j	2	11
					k	0	1
					l	0	2
					m	4	24
					n	9	41
		27	125			27	157
83	a	5	31	84	a	1	5
	b	2	17		b	1	9
	c	3	10		c	1	8
	d	3	10		d	2	6
	e	5	28		e	7	24
	f	4	19		f	8	34
	g	3	19		g	2	9
	h	2	22		h	1	12
Total		27	155		i	0	10
					j	4	26
						27	143

TABLE 11 (Continued)

Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses	Question	Behavior	No. First Behavior Responses	Total* Behavior Responses
85	a	3	13	86	a	0	2
	b	1	6		b	0	3
	c	3	13		c	1	5
	d	0	1		d	4	18
	e	6	19		e	1	6
	f	0	6		f	8	27
	g	1	7				
	h	0	3				
		14	68				
Total						11	61

sample was sufficient for conclusive induction and it is suggested that the ensuing year's study carry this aspect of the research further and supplement the sampling, both for qualitative and quantitative purposes.

2. Criteria for Scoring Responses

Table II presents the distribution of behavior responses as revealed by the twenty-eight principals. Where more than a single first behavior response was indicated by a principal (see Appendix C, Form C, last example, following the instructions), fractions were employed and rounded off after summations. "Total Behavior Response" was arrived at in the following manner:

a. Only the first three priority selections were acknowledged. Since the objective was to secure the principal's most usual behavior, it would have been inconsistent with this purpose to acknowledge all selections made by a principal in any single situation. On the other hand, since many responses revealed two or three choices for first priority, and the investigator desired a more intense study of distributions other than single choices, an arbitrary selection of the first three choices by respondents of their behaviors in each situation was accepted for analysis.

b. Since a priority factor existed, it appeared logical to place the most value upon the first choice selected. Three points were allotted to a first choice, two to a second choice, and ^{one}~~three~~ to a third.

In the event of equal priorities, the same six points were distributed. For example, if a principal selected two behaviors as equally employed most often, each would be accorded two and one-half points, his third choice being accorded the remaining point. The same proportional procedure was employed for other variations and fractions were rounded off in the final summations.

3. Criteria for Inspection to Determine Extent of Behavior Distribution

The assumption has been made (see Chapter I) that the behaviors of school principals differ. The extent to which these behaviors differ can be determined by increasing the sampling to an acceptable point whereby empirical evidence will reveal a given result. The researcher lacks sufficient evidence to assert whether the behaviors within any given situation lie on a normal curve, are equally distributed among a universe of behaviors, or satisfy some other condition.

In order to assure the functional value of the instrument being developed, it was necessary to ascertain the extent to which more than a single behavior was employed by principals. If a single behavior in a given situation was revealed by an excessively large number of principals, this situation would be meaningless in any attempts to discern the existence of behavior patterns of principals. However, the exact nature (qualitative) of the distributions were considered of no importance in terms of this purpose.

The investigator, unable to discover any precedent for establishing criteria (since no normal curve or equal distribution could be assumed as applicable to the distribution of behaviors), arbitrarily selected the following criteria as reasonable in terms of the purpose the instrument was to serve:

Non
para?

a. The distribution revealed in any given behavior grouping would be considered adequate if the behavior receiving the highest number of points did not exceed twice the number of points received by the second highest selected behavior.

b. The distribution revealed in any given behavior grouping would be considered adequate if the criterion stated above was satisfied by either the first behavior responses or the total behavior responses. The concern about distributions centered about the fact that insufficient discriminations by principals would nullify the value of a given situation for discerning patterns of behavior. Hence, if a single behavior was selected by a sufficiently large number of principals, it would nullify the value of that situation in the instrument. The decision to place significance upon a fifty per cent figure for relating second choices to first choices was neither approved nor rejected by the research staff.

The decision to include total behavior responses in the criteria was also made by the investigator. First priority choices were paramount for purposes of treating the instrument for external validity

(see Chapter V) and discovering patterns of behavior by a profile technique in the second phase of the University of Florida Study. For purposes of discerning distribution, however, the inclusion of second and third choice behaviors provided additional data for analysis and acted as a check on the results revealed by summing first behavior choices. Inspection of the results (see Table II) bear this out.

4. Tentative Conclusions

At this point in the study, Table II reveals tentative conclusions. Inspection reveals that Questions 18, 21, 25, 47, 54, and 63 failed to meet the criteria, i. e., failed to meet the first criterion for both first behavior responses and total behavior responses. It is interesting to note that all behavior groupings that failed to satisfy the criterion when applied to total behavior response also failed to satisfy when applied to first behavior responses.

The converse, however, is not true. Questions 17, 24, 28, 34, 56, 59, 65, 72, 73, 76, and 77, while failing to satisfy the first criterion when applied to first behavior responses, did satisfy it when applied to total behavior responses.

The conclusion, at this point, is that the six questions listed above, in failing to meet both criteria, indicate distributions that are not satisfactory for discriminating among the behaviors of school principals. However, the criteria are arbitrary; the inspection results

are tentative. Further sampling and the possibility of arriving at more acceptable criteria provide the next investigator with the possibility of a different set of conclusions.

F. Internal and External Validity

Jordan defined validity as follows:

If, then, the instrument which is chosen reflects accurately the degree of attainment of a defined objective it is valid for that purpose. To ensure this validity careful test builders exert great care (1) in the construction of the test, and (2) in correlating it with some external criterion. We might call the first of these internal validity; the second, external validity.³

Chapters II and III, in discussing the determination of situations and the development of the possible behaviors, dealt with the manner in which internal validity was sought. Chapters IV and V will deal with external validity.

³A. M. Jordan, Measurement in Education, p. 15. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1953.

CHAPTER IV

THE CASE STUDIES

1. The Meaning of External Validity in This Study

The development of the instrument was an effort directed toward ascertaining behavior by a pencil and paper technique. If the instrument succeeded in revealing how the principal actually did behave, we would then be able to assert that it succeeded in doing what it was supposed to do. This validity was of an external nature and was a test of the extent to which the responses of the principal, utilizing pencil and paper to record his behavior, corresponded to the way he actually did behave.

2. Purpose and Methods of Securing Case Study Evidence.

The major purpose of visiting the schools was one of accumulating data to test for external validity. Anderson and Anderson have presented the value of the approach as follows:

If predictions concern overt behavior, criteria are available from observation and case materials . . . Such studies can be planned so that the evidence, accumulated via a variety of techniques, can be cross-checked for distortion or consistency.¹

¹Harold H. Anderson and Gladys L. Anderson, An Introduction to Projective Techniques, p. 47, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951.

It was decided to make case studies of the principals of the four schools studied intensively. The case studies were the evidences of the actual behaviors of the principals and were employed as tests of the extent to which the principals, in responding to the Principal Behavior Check List, recorded their actual behaviors.

Evidence was secured by (1) the observations of seven investigators -- the writer assuming the major portion of the responsibility, (2) interviews with teachers, (3) interviews with students, and (4) interviews with secretarial and custodial personnel. The case studies did not contain any statements made by the principals, themselves.

The observations, made during the period of an entire school year, did not provide all the information needed. In such instances, if other sources of information revealed consistent data, this information was utilized. Hence, if no information was available from observation about the extent to which a principal made use of his custodian, the custodian and various teachers were approached with the open-ended question, "How is the custodian used in the school program?" If most teachers agreed with the custodian, his response was utilized as evidence to replace the lack of observation by the research team.

In some situations concerning student behavior, students were selected at random and interviewed individually and by groups. This (and all other) information was cross-checked with teacher reactions

to the same questions. Where responses were indicative of a high degree of conflict or the evidence obtained was insufficient for drawing conclusions, such material was omitted from the case studies (see Chapter V, Table III). Where doubt existed on the part of the writer, the other investigators and the coordinator of the research project were asked to comment on their perceptions of the principal's behavior in the given situation.

3. Case Study Criteria

Certain criteria were employed in selecting pertinent material for each case study. The following criteria were used:

- a. Information relative to principal behavior only, as outlined by the questions contained in Form B (see Appendix B), were utilized.
- b. Where specifics for a given behavior were too numerous, the most typical were presented.
- c. Where evidence from observation was lacking, but sufficient agreement resulted from open-ended interviews and the opinions of other investigators, the indirect evidence was utilized. If agreement was lacking, the situations were omitted from the case study.

4. Application of the Case Studies

The evidence revealed in the case studies was used to test for the external validity of the instrument. If the four principals, in

responding to the instrument, recorded their behavior in a manner identical to the evidence revealed in the case studies, the investigator assumed that he was in a position to assert that the instrument achieved exactly what it was intended to achieve. A percentage of correspondence was sought by pairing the case study evidence of a principal's behavior in a given situation with his response to the same situation as presented in the instrument.

The steps followed were:

1. Studying and recording the behaviors of each principal.
2. Organizing the data by key situations (case studies).
3. On the basis of the organized data, predicting the responses to the instrument which, if made by each principal, would indicate that the instrument achieved exactly what it was intended to achieve.
4. Administering the instrument to the four principals.
5. Inspecting the two sets of data and comparing the predicted responses to the instrument made by the investigator with the responses made by each principal.
6. Arriving at a percentage of correspondence (or validity percentage) for each of the four principals studied.

This chapter dealt with the first two steps; the remaining steps were dealt with in Chapter V. The first step was accomplished through the year's intensive study of the four schools by the research team --

this investigator specializing in studying the behaviors of the principals. The second step was accomplished by isolating from the research files all behaviors of principals that related to the key situations in the open-ended instrument.

The actual behavior of the principals was treated and categorized in the same order as the four areas of interaction presented in the open-ended instrument (see Appendix B, Form B). Both the case studies and Form B began with the principal's behavior relating to individual teachers and, specifically, his basis for selecting a new teacher.

5. The Case Studies

Principal A's Behavior Relating to Individual Teachers

The principal selects his teachers on the basis of those available through application with the county, or through contact with a college. He and the superintendent may interview his applicant separately or together and, while both must approve, the major decision rests with the principal. The superintendent is less likely to help locate applicants than the principal.

Orientation for the new teacher consists of the principal's telling the teacher what is expected of him. The principal makes himself available for questions by visiting with every teacher daily. Much of the orientation is provided by teachers although a committee is

currently writing a handbook.

Any teacher may confer with the principal when he feels a need arise by having a pupil deliver a note to that effect to the principal. The principal is usually available and will visit the teacher in his classroom. This is the more common conference procedure as opposed to a session in the principal's office which is located near the elementary school. At times, a teacher gets another to watch his group and finds the principal who is usually "making the rounds."

When a teacher sees him about a discipline problem he takes whatever action he deems necessary. The result is usually a matter of the principal's offering his advice or seeing the pupil and meting out the discipline himself. Some of the problems that might otherwise reach the principal are attended to by the student council.

When a teacher sees him about a problem involving another teacher, he sometimes approaches the other teacher and settles it as fairly as he can or generalizes on the problem at a faculty meeting. He does so in a manner that does not reveal who initiated the issue. At other times, he settles it by calling them together to "point out what a picture they make before the students."

When a teacher sees him about a personal problem he explores the situation with him and offers his advice. If it can't be resolved in this manner, he will initiate further action to help solve the problem. He makes every attempt to help the teacher feel secure in this process.

When a teacher sees him about a parent problem, he investigates prior to deciding on any action. He contacts the parent, frequently, soothes him as best he can, explains the school's views, and tends to support the teacher's position. The teacher is usually present for such conferences.

Teachers find little need to see their principal about problems involving school policies except for clarification. He supplies it. At times he suggests that they bring the problem before the faculty or does so himself.

Teachers who see him about an instructional problem may be asked for their own solution. The principal then determines the solution. He has offered to teach lessons to demonstrate. One teacher related a problem emanating from the county supervisor's telling him what to teach. In this instance, the principal asked the teacher to cooperate but not be too concerned about pleasing the supervisor unless the cooperation was mutual. There is much friction between the supervisor and the school staff. The staff, with a few exceptions, feels that the supervisor "plays the parents against us."

The principal is close to class methods and content of study. He has his teachers write lesson plans and visits every classroom daily (at times, three or four visits per day) for brief visits about routine matters. When he is interested in the situation or, upon teacher request, he may remain in the room to observe. In doing so, he sits or

stands quietly and enters the discussion upon the teacher's request.

There are numerous factors involved in his determining which classrooms to visit and how frequently to visit them. He will visit to distribute mail, supply coin change for children to purchase sodas and candy, secure material from classroom closets, and see generally "how his teachers are doing." He does not hesitate to talk with his teachers during these visits and exchange greetings with the class as a whole. On occasion he will joke with a youngster openly.

In his attempts to assist teachers to improve their work, he may suggest materials that they might be using (although this is generally limited to a simple device or text in his office). If a classroom is overcrowded, he may rearrange student groupings and schedules. If a teacher does not request any help, he may either confine his aid to observation, give direct advice, or not bother to attempt help. The most usual procedure in evidence is one that fluctuates from apathetic to directive behavior.

He does not formally rate his teachers or discuss his opinions. When a teacher does a good job, he will personally acknowledge it or do so indirectly by complimenting the teacher's class. Another reward is the delegation of more responsibility. When a teacher does something that he considers annoying or harmful, he tends to let him know it, indirectly, by calling a faculty meeting and raising the issue with the group. This, while a more common procedure when more than one

teacher is involved, is not limited to a situation of group infraction. He may change a teacher's assignment if the issue is serious and involves a group of students. In individual cases, however, he prefers to do nothing. If the situation does not improve, he will dismiss the teacher. In doing so, he notifies the superintendent who, in turn, notifies the teacher.

When a teacher makes a private suggestion to him that involves the school as a whole, he tends to listen and make the decision. At times, he says, "It won't work," and at others may say, "You can try it but will have to defend yourself if any criticism comes." He may bring the issue to the total faculty for discussion prior to deciding, as a means of "taking the pressure off him." If the suggestion merely concerns the teacher involved, as in the case of making a change in what he is doing in his classroom, the principal may permit the teacher to work out his solution on a trial basis.

It is rare that a teacher will question the principal's ideas or methods. This situation may result in the principal's "threatening politely" the one who opposes. His response usually involves an assertion that the majority is with him. His tendency is to get what he wants by explaining his position and convincing others. "He will not change his ways regardless of the number of teachers for or against him." If an individual teacher opposes a decision most are in harmony with, he may not assert himself, as such, but tell the teacher that he

"can't oppose the majority."

The principal's behavior relating to the external pressures brought to bear upon teachers is generally one of protection. If the problem is difficult, he takes it to the superintendent. He backs the teacher in the face of any demands or pressures he considers unreasonable. He tries to meet individual parental pressures half way and will not support the teacher if his case is weak. Otherwise, he backs the teacher. When a parental group is involved, he discusses and explains the situation of concern. In one instance he asked the parents to observe the class of a teacher whose practices were not acceptable to them. On more than one occasion, he has spoken at the church to reprimand parents "in a nice way." He exhibited this behavior at the only P. T. A. meeting of the year in regard to the problem of parents keeping their youngsters at home to help them during their harvesting season.

The school has no clerical or custodial help. The bus driver is not made a part of the school program.

Principal A's Behavior Relating to Teachers as Groups

When the principal wishes his teachers to join a professional organization, he sends a messenger to each teacher to deliver a slip of paper mentioning his desire. They tend to obey, although they did object on one occasion when the dues had been raised. He convinced them of the need to continue their membership by calling a faculty meeting

immediately. He has never tried to discourage teachers from joining any teacher organization.

The assignments for class and grade schedules are determined by the principal. He tells his teachers what their schedules are to be at the onset of the school year and decides what changes need to be made to fit a new situation.

Some teachers volunteer for extra-class activity assignments though the principal determines which activities will be part of the program. One teacher had the responsibility for girls' sports, and when some girls and their parents were dissatisfied with the work, the principal assigned a major sport to another teacher on the basis of his judgment and the fact that the latter teacher preferred the added assignment.

Internal funds are deposited in the bank. The sources for securing them are few. With the exception of the profit from sports, little money is available other than that raised by individual teachers for specific purposes. The funds are earmarked by the contributors and require the principal's approval for use.

The principal, while friendly with his faculty, is quite formal in his frequent daily interactions. He sees every teacher daily on his rounds of classrooms and is "strictly business" although he is more sociable with some than others. Relationships after school are different. He is very friendly and gets together with most teachers during

the course of the year. They have numerous parties. He is especially friendly with two teachers after school hours.

He does not eat his lunch with a group but with one, perhaps two teachers, each day. The teachers are not the same each day, although one member of the faculty is on the preferred list. He may eat in his office or a classroom and his seating position, when eating with others, varies.

The principal decides the agenda for faculty meetings and calls them when he feels an administrative need. Teachers are usually notified on the same day as the meeting is to take place, sometimes an hour prior to the close of the school day. A messenger brings the notice to each class. The principal usually sits at the front desk in these meetings and maintains the leadership responsibility.

There are few committees. As the result of a four day workshop this past summer, committees were set up and functioned briefly, dissolving as soon as he permitted them to do so. The only committees in evidence, other than those emanating from the workshop, include one that worked with the principal to arrive at school policies. This, however, dissolved when completing its function. The school policies were more a product of faculty meetings (prior to this year) than the committee mentioned. Another active committee is one currently working on a handbook. The principal decides committee needs and functions and leads or advises in his working role with them.

The principal rarely makes decisions contrary to school policy. Policies are based on county rather than teacher initiated purposes and are stated in a set of fourteen rules and regulations pertaining to teachers only. When the principal does find a need to deviate from these policies, he explains his reasons for doing so at faculty meetings.

When teachers behave in contrast to the existing policies, the principal may call a faculty meeting to let them know of this. He is direct on the issue without mentioning the names of the teachers involved. They know whom he refers to, however. If they repeat the offense, he tells them that "they are no good with this group."

When the principal wishes to bring about changes in content or course offerings, he "just does it." There is little change in evidence beyond that of verbalizing. There is no experimental work in progress. Subject standards for classes are those directly related to texts or indirectly resulting from testing.

When a school-wide discipline problem exists that the principal or his teachers identify, he personally visits with the classes or groups involved and tells them the nature of the behavior he expects of them. If necessary, he metes out punishment. His action usually follows a faculty discussion on the problem with the ultimate decision resting with the principal.

There is no evidence of teachers evaluating their progress as a total faculty on a specific program change. Nor does the faculty

evaluate its human relationships. The principal tells them what conduct he hopes for or expects.

Principal A's Behavior Relating to Students

When a teacher lets the principal know about the misbehavior of a student, the principal advises on a course of action. If he considers the offense serious, and it generally is before the teacher calls the principal's attention to it, the student is either whipped, given some unpleasant duty such as raking the yards, or both. If serious enough, the student may be suspended. This, however, is rarely necessary. Teachers refer some of these problems directly to the student council.

Should the principal observe a student infraction, he may scold or whip the youngster after questioning him to determine the facts. If the responsible teacher is present and fails to act, the principal may scold the teacher later or follow through with the punishment himself. His actions with students do not usually take place before others.

The principal's behavior, when he learns of a class getting out of hand, consists of sitting in on the class for a period of a few days. At times, he directly takes over the class.

When he learns of the misbehavior of a group of pupils away from school, he will either whip the youngsters involved or suspend them from school. Suspensions range from two to ten days. Should he

witness the misbehavior, he is not likely to say or do anything at the moment. He would most likely send for the youngsters the following school day.

It is very rare that a student makes a suggestion to the principal that involves the school as a whole. The principal's tendency is to accept the suggestion, if sound in his judgment. If the suggestion for improvement concerns athletics, he is likely to accept the idea.

The principal's relationships with students involve occasional joking. He has played ping pong and participated in other sports activities with students. He has accompanied them on field trips. On the whole, however, he does not usually attempt to get too close to students in his personal-social relationships.

His planning with students is primarily confined to the student council. There is little in the way of planning with pupils, and teachers handle most of it. While he does not lead, he participates, maintains veto power, and uses it whenever a decision is made that might be contrary to the best interests of the school. In these situations he may either veto directly or criticize and improve on the suggestion or issue involved. If they are not far apart, he will try to compromise with students. His role has been summarized by others as one of listening and telling.

Aside from student council activities, he has planned financial drives and the setting of dates for class activities with students.

However, the principal rarely involves pupils in these decisions and, while he works with them, the planning is leader centered. He is more active with students in such activities as caretaking, sports, and socials in the school.

The school has a set of rules and regulations governing student conduct. A teacher sponsor and the student council arrived at these rules subject to the principal's approval. Some rules have been added by the faculty. His role, in addition to that of final decision maker, was one of adding to the rules where he saw a need for them.

Student talent and labor are used for sports events to raise money, for speakers entered in county contests, for singing and speeches at commencement, and for clean-up tasks invoked as punishment. Evidence of the use of the home economics students is found in their giving demonstrations in homes.

The occasion is the determining factor in when students will be used and scholastic records determine which ones will be used. Teacher sponsors working with athletes know which ones will do the best job and the principal is rarely involved in the selection of student talent or labor except when he invokes punishment in the form of raking the yards or cleaning the rooms.

The principal does not conduct parent-pupil conferences that deal with problems of promotion, school transfer, future vocation, etc. These conferences are not in evidence. In dealing with disciplinary

problems, he will punish the student and, at times, call the parent in afterwards. In such conferences the principal determines the ultimate solution. The evidence reveals few three way conferences that include teachers or pupils. The exception is rare and is not usually planned by the principal.

There is little evidence of social cliques. Teachers feel that any such occurrence would result in his decision to "keep out of it."

One means that this principal utilizes to help his pupils that might be unique involves "picking up lumber, personally, for their shop work." He is physically active in numerous tasks that are generally considered custodial duties.

Principal A's Behavior Relating to Community Members

The school possesses no telephone and parents cannot communicate with him unless they visit the school.

His procedure in dealing with an irate parent who visits him to complain about a teacher's action usually entails "trying to soften him up" and a guarantee that he will look into the matter. He promises to discuss the subject with the teacher afterward. If the complaint involves his own action, "he won't take any guff" but will discuss the matter with the parent. He tries to have a witness available in these situations, tries to calm the parent, and then sell him on their common goals.

The only formal dissemination of school publicity takes place through a school newspaper. The principal is not involved in the activity except to make a contribution on occasion.

The principal does not participate in public issues or elections unless they are of direct concern to him or the school. This is infrequent. He did campaign in the community for a recent amendment to provide school buildings and extended his commitment by issuing mimeographed copies of the school's position through the students. His activity is guided by his perception of what the central office wishes.

His purpose in contacting parents, other than for disciplinary reasons, is limited to sending notes home through the children to notify parents of a P. T. A. meeting or Open-House day. There has been one of the former this past year and an Open-House day is contemplated for this year. When individual needs arise, he either instructs the pupil to deliver a message or teachers personally visit the homes.

The P. T. A. does not function as a body with expressed purposes. It has made some financial contributions, but not many of either. The occasions for meeting are rare. The only purpose evident in the one meeting that took place during the past year was to seek parent cooperation in keeping the youngsters in school during the farming season so as to reduce the unusually high absentee rate. The principal attends these functions when they occur and tells his teachers

to be present.

The school makes no effort to utilize lay people for improving its program. There have been no formal efforts at improving the school program since a pre-planning workshop, and, the only attempt at including the community in school thinking or planning, resulted in teachers telling parents what they wished from them in the way of cooperation at a P. T. A. meeting called for that purpose. Phases of the school program such as field trips, sports, school policies, etc. are not discussed with lay groups. When the principal does contact parents for aid, all interested in participating are utilized.

The principal has made a few extemporaneous talks in his dealings with the community, preferring not to make planned speeches. He will, however, when asked to. He encourages other faculty members to make speeches when such opportunities arise, but they are rare.

He does not represent the school with any community groups but has been active as an American Legion fund raiser, Mason, church member, and works with the Boy Scouts.

The only evidence of a community group attempting to influence the school program involves the Mom and Dad's Club. Many teachers and the principal feel that, while this group is not well organized or active, the supervisor has been attempting to move them in a direction in opposition to the ways of working of the school staff. The principal's policy has been to listen and ignore such parental opposition after

having tried to sell them on the school program. He has secured teacher backing in his position with the supervisor.

Although there has been no open opposition to the principal from community groups or individuals, the teachers feel he would ignore it should it occur. He has consulted with the superintendent when possible threats have arisen.

When the principal wishes to initiate a fund-raising drive, he calls a faculty meeting, explains his purpose, and they act upon it. At times he moves from class to class to help teachers initiate it with students.

There has been no formal attempt to evaluate the school-community relationships.

Principal B's Behavior Relating to Individual Teachers

Although the principal made the suggestion early in the year that teachers share responsibility in the selection of a new teacher, it was rejected by the faculty and he is responsible for the function. The principal maintains a close contact with a university as a personnel selection technique, in addition to possessing applications from individuals available in his county. He interviews prior to commitment for a position but this is not the final step in approval. The County Board has overruled him on the basis of allotting precedence to county residents.

To orient new teachers, the principal has vested some of the responsibility with a pre-planning committee. The committee decided that a new teacher may select a veteran faculty member to help orient him. The principal has been known to permit a new teacher to spend a day visiting another school so as to gain insight into his job. Participation in pre-planning workshops helps orient new teachers and the principal assists by providing handbooks, bulletins, etc.

The principal makes himself accessible to any teacher for a conference by making known his "open-door policy." Teachers may also make appointments with him.

The principal rarely sees teachers about discipline problems. This responsibility is in the hands of the assistant principal, in the case of boys, and the dean of girls in the case of girls. On rare occasions, when teachers approach him directly, he may make personal suggestions and has been known to advise them to observe another teacher.

When a teacher approaches him about a problem involving another teacher, he listens but does not usually take action or get involved in personalities. He tries to help the teacher view the other teacher's strengths and abilities. If he considers the problem a serious one, he may investigate it with the other teacher.

When a teacher sees him about a personal problem, he will listen and advise in a manner that does not leave the teacher with a feeling

of commitment. The nature of the problem determines whether he will be sympathetic and advise with an attempted detachment or joke and treat it lightly. The need for teachers seeing him about personal problems is infrequent and the evidence reveals that he distinguishes between school and personal life.

When a teacher sees him about a parent problem, he may call on the assistant principal for a three way conference. An alternative is his behavior of discussing it with the teacher and advising him. His advice on parent problems, and most any problem involving a teacher, is generally followed by leaving the teacher free to make her own decision.

The principal will also use one of two procedures in dealing with a teacher who sees him about a school policy problem, depending upon the nature of the problem. He may say, "This is a faculty policy and I cannot change it. You can bring it up to the planning committee." On the other hand, he has been known, after considering the problem seriously, to offer active help by going before the faculty or committee, himself, or seeing an influential teacher who is highly concerned about the policy to discuss enforcing or changing it.

When a teacher sees him about an instructional problem, he is usually ready with materials and suggestions. When he feels that he cannot help, he may refer the teacher to someone else who can.

The principal makes numerous, brief visits to classrooms to

talk with teachers and this helps him determine what they are teaching. He has other means of determining this, viz., checking with department heads and talking with students. "He is not essentially a class observer but will do so upon request. Most of his observations are casual."

Extended classroom visits are usually prompted by his hearing of a complaint or upon an invitation by a teacher. The principal's restlessness and energy may also be a factor in determining when he will visit.

His behavior in visiting classrooms includes teaching by teacher request (usually English), talking with the teacher, and casually looking at books and exhibits about the room. He rarely observes a teacher directly.

Other means that he may utilize in his attempts to assist teachers in their instruction consist of distributing bulletins on good class procedures and suggestions that a teacher visit a classroom where he feels that good teaching is in progress. He does not usually help unless teachers request it.

When he feels that a teacher should be improving in her work, and she does not request help in doing so, he may either call the teacher in for a conference or use indirect means. The latter practice may be accomplished by a bulletin directed generally to teachers, or the principal may suggest a departmental meeting at which he will discuss the problem with the department head prior to the meeting. Otherwise,

he does not attempt to help unless he hears complaints from others about a teacher's practices.

He does not evaluate his teachers on written forms. His judgments are personal and are rarely revealed. When a teacher does good work, he may personally commend her class. Usually, however, he does nothing.

The principal does not tend to behave in a direct manner when one of his teachers does something he considers annoying or harmful. If one or two teachers make a habit of coming in late, he will distribute a bulletin requesting that all teachers report on time and this procedure is utilized for similar infractions. If need be, he resorts to a personal conference and will dismiss a teacher if he deems the teacher behavior to be very harmful.

The principal's procedure in refusing to rehire a teacher is usually one of refusing to recommend. An alternate method in evidence is one of being provocative so as to encourage a breach of county regulations (e. g., giving an order he knows the teacher will refuse to follow which results in a charge of insubordination. On one occasion he required that a teacher resign in his presence).

When a teacher makes suggestions privately to him that involve the school as a whole he is prone to listen. Depending upon the extent of his agreement, he may accept and act upon it or reject it. His usual action involves bringing the suggestion before a committee or requesting

that the teacher seek the cooperation he requests. These procedures are also typical of the principal's behavior when a teacher's suggestion involves the teacher more directly than the school, as a whole.

The attitude of a teacher opposing his ideas or methods is the prime determinant in how the principal will react. If he is not confronted with it directly, he ignores it. He may listen patiently and accept the opposition when confronted with it. However, he is equally likely to become irritated and refuse to acknowledge the opposition.

When a teacher opposes the decision made by a teacher group, he tells the teacher that the group decision comes first. His reaction is negative to this type of teacher behavior and his rejection may result in irritation or anger.

The principal's attempts to protect his teachers from outside pressures during the routine school schedule include requiring desk permission for lay people to enter the school, and refusing to permit class interruptions. The secretary will not interrupt teachers for phone calls and her instructions are to take a message for the teacher and tell the caller that the teacher can telephone back later.

An individual parent's pressure brought to bear upon a teacher is frequently met by the principal's accepting the pressure and maintain-ign the parent contact himself. He has developed techniques for calming parents prior to their discussions with teachers. He tries to support his teachers but will not if he feels that the parent's complaint is

justified.

The principal's usual behavior regarding pressure on a teacher from a parent group is to weigh the facts and take his stand. He attempts to clarify and settle issues where possible and refrains from repeating criticisms to the teacher, if at all feasible. He receives support from the assistant principal in attempting to keep the teacher unavailable to the group until the pressure wears off. He and the assistant principal attempt to maintain the contacts with lay individuals or groups that bring pressure to bear upon teachers.

The principal's action in preparing his secretary for working with pupils and the community has been to use student clerical helpers to relieve her for engaging in such contacts. The previous year's secretary, now a teacher in the school, was authorized by the principal to work with the new secretary during pre-planning. The principal involves the new secretary as much as possible in dealing directly with parents and frequently discusses her role in community relations with her.

There is no evidence to the effect that the custodian or bus drivers are a part of the school program except as he frequently discusses the custodian's work with him.

Principal B's Behavior Relating to Teachers as Groups

The principal utilizes two methods of encouraging teachers to join professional organizations. The teacher planning committee selects a teacher to see teachers individually for the collection of dues early in the school year and the principal, simultaneously, utilizes office bulletins to notify teachers that the time for continuing membership in these organizations is at hand. There is no coercion and the principal has never attempted to discourage his teachers from joining any organizations.

Extra class activities are not assigned by the principal. The planning committee selects teachers for these assignments and volunteering enters the process in that teachers are free to reject a given assignment and choose another. At one time, the principal assumed this responsibility on the basis of equalizing loads and teacher interest and ability to handle an assignment. He will still help in this manner when a controversy arises.

The principal determines teacher class and grade schedules on the bases of teacher employment qualifications, expediency, the desires of his teachers, and student pre-registration for courses. Teachers are encouraged before the close of the school year to discuss the next year's program with students and explore possibilities of a new course the individual teacher may wish to initiate. A recent example of this is the offering of a new physical science course. Teachers fill out a

request form each year applying for the classes they prefer to teach. If enough students request a change in offering, this will alter the program. A sufficient number of students requesting a new course can lead to the offering. The principal makes up the schedule during the pre-planning period on the above mentioned bases.

Internal fund use is determined by the school finance committee with the help of the principal. They devise a budget. In some instances, sponsors determine their own with the aid of students.

The principal's personal-social relationships with his faculty is one where lines cannot be sharply drawn. He is friendly with all and often jokes with his staff. Almost half of the staff has a first name relationship with him. He tends to associate most frequently with those who share his interests during after-school hours. His hobby of fishing determines those who have closest relationship with him after school. During school hours, interests in sports and English draw him closest to those teachers involved.

He does not select specific teachers to eat lunch with. An interest of the moment may determine whom he chooses to eat with. The lunch period is a long one and there is a table in the cafeteria reserved for staff members. His appetite largely determines the time he will eat and he may sit anywhere at the table.

The planning committee forms the agenda for faculty meetings and his role is that of resource person. He participates in most of the

committee meetings and feels free to make suggestions which, while usually accepted, are sometimes voted down. On occasion, when a special situation arises, he will ask permission to set the agenda.

The planning committee chairman leads faculty meetings and the principal is a member of the group. However, he has assumed leadership at critical moments of dissension. His role is active and varies from suggestion seeker to suggestion giver to question answerer. He requests resistance to the stands he takes but resistance is much less usual than typical. He has no special seat in a circular seating arrangement.

The principal does not determine the need for the faculty meeting. It is held on alternate Wednesdays. Formerly, his needs or those of others (less frequently), did determine the occasions for meetings.

He is an ex-officio member of other committees and will attend meetings upon request or if he discerns a need or interest. He will not lead unless requested to do so. This behavior applies to departmental meetings, as well, and the principal moves from one to another as resource person.

The functions of committees are determined by the faculty and those teachers directly involved in the committee. The principal has made suggestions. They have not always been accepted.

The planning committee usually knows teacher preferences for

serving on committees. Hence, volunteering is one basis. They try to be impartial in spreading responsibilities. The principal feels free to make suggestions. All are not accepted.

When a committee has prepared a report or recommendation, it is brought to the faculty, as a whole, for discussion and vote. If the principal does not feel that it is in the best interests of the school to accept it, he speaks against it. The faculty may reconsider or table it for further consideration. While the principal's ideas have been overridden, they generally are not.

His usual procedure in determining when a committee or faculty, as a whole, is ready to make a decision, is to wait until almost all have expressed their opinions and a consensus of thinking emerges. Since he rarely leads, his behavior encourages participation from all prior to decision making. A departure from this occurs, at times, when he reminds a committee that they have a duty to move toward making a decision.

School policies are arrived at by a standing committee. In the past, the principal appointed a faculty group to attend to the function, but this is no longer the procedure.

The principal rarely makes a decision contrary to school policy. However, whether it be due to the ambiguous form of the question, to the inconsistency of principal behavior, to faulty perceptions of what does constitute school policy, or the fact that the process of procedures is

undergoing a change not easily discernable to all involved, this question begs for agreement in response from questioning teachers. Two teachers believe that he will make a decision contrary to the policy when it is expedient, with the understanding that the faculty can change it later. A third teacher believes this to be unusual behavior except when a situation presents itself that might lead to more dissension among faculty members were the principal not to violate school policy. The principal, earlier in the year, never perceived of his actions as violating policy, yet on one occasion admitted that, at times, he might not be consistent due to extenuating circumstances. (The observations of the investigators led to disagreements similar to those expressed by teachers. On the whole, however, most agreed that the principal rarely violated the school policies.)

The pattern of behavior of this principal, while complex in many school situations, is most difficult to establish in this area. However, most of the evidence reveals that he generally explains such actions to the faculty in accounting for policy violations.

When the faculty questions his decisions, the principal may become angry or critical. There is more than one evidence of this, yet the tone of the questioning has proved a determining factor in other instances and has been such that he displayed no irritation. There is much agreement to the effect that he does not hold grudges and forgets personal issues quickly. As a rule, he will modify his views if the

faculty, as a whole, disagree with him.

When teachers violate school policy, he tends to call them to his office to discuss the matter personally. If serious enough, he will warn the violator and has been known to dismiss a faculty member for insubordination.

The principal's most usual means for promoting experimental work in classrooms is to express interest in what his teachers are doing and be sympathetic to teacher suggestions to practice new ideas. He is quick to offer aid and assistance in such endeavors. At committee and faculty meetings he offers suggestions for curriculum revision and has personally initiated "faculty working together on democratic ideas."

Most of the subject standards stem from the county, as a whole, and the principal is not active in this to any marked extent. However, in experimental work in progress, he works with teachers, individually, to help them set up standards. Standardized achievement tests in some grades help maintain standards at these levels. In addition, he is active in attending departmental meetings where standards are discussed.

His efforts to bring about changes in course offerings or content take the form of encouraging departmental supervision and following teacher suggestions. In-service courses have influenced such changes. Two recent changes have been initiated by teacher suggestion

to the principal and faculty approval. Most changes are brought before the faculty. Some changes result from the system of students stating their course preferences prior to the beginning of the school year and others from workshops and experimental projects initiated by teachers and encouraged by the principal.

When a school-wide discipline problem presents itself that is identified by either teachers or the principal, he usually delegates the authority and responsibility to the assistant principal and dean of girls. However, if serious, he will work with them toward a solution. An example of an exceptional situation, where he did actively participate toward meeting the problem, occurred in 1950. He called in specialists to talk with the P. T. A. and other parents in a large assemblage. The specialists included a psychiatrist and guidance counselor. The action included bringing the problem before groups of parents, students, and teachers.

The principal utilizes committee work during the post-planning period of school as a means of getting his total faculty to evaluate their progress. He recently distributed a questionnaire to the staff designed to secure their reactions concerning his way of working in relation to faculty progress and this has served as an evaluative method.

Program changes are evaluated through small group work during the pre-planning period -- primarily in departmental meetings.

They are not formal. The principal has introduced a system of evaluation of activities used by the student council.

There is no evidence of the principal and his staff's evaluating their human relations.

Principal B's Behavior Relating to Students

Teachers rarely discuss the misbehavior of a student with the principal because he has delegated this responsibility to the assistant principal and dean of girls. The principal may discuss a serious problem with the teacher. When he does, he tends to offer suggestions toward a solution. However, such problems rarely come to his attention and when a teacher wishes to refer a student to one of higher status, girls are sent to the dean of girls; boys to the assistant principal.

When the principal observes student misconduct and no teacher is present he will usually caution the students involved. At times he has caused a student to remain after school and, when serious, has referred students to his assistant or dean of girls.

Such occurrences, when a teacher is present and fails to act, do not result in principal-student interaction. The principal's procedure is usually one of calling the teacher aside or seeing him in the office, his choice being made on the basis of expediency in the situation.

The evidence gathered by talking with student groups reveals one situation in which the principal learned of a teacher's class getting

out of hand. He met it by visiting the class and saying "he'd punish them if it continued." This, according to the students, succeeded in solving the problem for all concerned. The teacher evaluated the problem with the principal in a private conference.

When the principal learns of the misbehavior of a group of students away from the school, if it is in connection with a school sponsored event, he will refer the matter to the assistant principal or dean of girls. If the situation is divorced from the work of the school and no external pressure is involved, he will ignore it.

The principal, when in the presence of a group of students who misbehave away from the school, will not hesitate to remind them of the conduct expected. However, if the situation is not one that the school is directly concerned with, he will likely ignore the behavior. In either event, he is likely to call the matter to the attention of the deans at school.

When students make suggestions to the principal that involve the school, as a whole, he puts them into effect or explains his reasons for not being able to. Otherwise, he refers them to the student government or sponsor of the activity. He is rarely approached directly on such matters although occasions arise when students request his presence in student government regarding a change in school procedure. He will act as judge in these situations, allowing the change to take place, if deemed reasonable in his judgment. Students acting on their own in

their desire to make suggestions are more likely to approach the sponsor of student government or the assistant principal.

It is rare that students make suggestions to the principal on matters involving the student, personally. On such occasions, the principal tends to listen and advise if the student wishes.

The principal's personal-social relationships with pupils have been observed and described as "helpful and friendly-but not personal," and "not always strictly business."

His prime activity that involves bringing students into planning with him is in the realm of the activity program. He is also active in planning with the student government. Policies that affect students, their clubs, sports, etc., are usually met by the principal in the above mention planning sessions. Much of the planning with students is conducted by teachers and staff wishes often determine the subject of the planning. The principal's planning with students had been a procedure contributing to the present stage of the program. During a previous survey of the needs of students, he involved students in planning the survey with him. He usually waits for students and teacher sponsors to request his attendance at their club meetings.

Evidence involving his role in planning with students reveals his role as a resource person and "one of the group." He plays this role whether chairing the group or participating on teacher or student request as an invited member.

The principal follows one or more of three courses of action when students make decisions that he believes are detrimental to the best interests of the school. He may talk with the students, personally, and explain his reasons for disagreeing with their decision. He may consult with the sponsor of the group and indirectly have his views expressed through the sponsor. He may, if necessary, exert his veto power. On the whole, he attempts to compromise in preference to the veto action.

Aside from his planning with students, activities he shares with them include sitting with teams engaged in sports, transporting track members for events away from school, occasionally accompanying a group on a field trip, teaching a few English classes each year, and entering into routine student government discussions.

The faculty, as a whole, has been responsible for establishing most rules involving students. Those rules applying to students are contained in the student handbook. Recently, the student council has played a more active part in determining rules. The principal participates with both groups in such actions.

The principal makes use of student talent or labor through clerical help in the office; the band at assemblies; the debate club in contest with those of other schools; managers keeping athletic fields in good order; Hi-Y and Key Clubs keeping school grounds clean and attending to shrubbery; and art exhibits for parent open-house.

He uses the students outside of school by permitting the band to perform for public events and having Key Club officers speak at Kiwanis meetings.

Teachers and activity sponsors, rather than the principal, are apt to determine when students will be used -- the guiding principle being that it does not interfere with student classwork. The decisions are based upon volunteering by students as opposed to adults convincing or coercing for participation and these students are chosen by teachers and sponsors.

The principal is not usually involved in conferences with parents and pupils or teachers and pupils on matters of promotion, school transfer, future vocation or discipline. The responsibility for these conferences is generally in the province of the assistant principal or dean of girls. On occasion, the principal may be involved in a three or four way conference on promotion and his procedure is one of trying to bring minds together by discussion of the case background. He may make the final decision himself. The one area of conferences of the above nature that he frequently participates in is that of college scholarships. He follows the procedure of bringing minds together, feeling free to offer suggestions.

On the rare occasion that pupil-pupil conferences take place, the principal's prime role is that of getting the pupils to do the talking.

There is little evidence from observations and interviews of

social cliques existing in the school and teachers feel that the principal's attempt to get pupils to excel in activities, where they can receive praise, helps prevent a need for in-groups. Prior to this year of research study, a student attempt to form a sorority and fraternity was dealt with by the assistant principal. He enforced a state law forbidding such an organization. Students were most vocal in their assertions that cliques are not operative and one who recently transferred from a California school, and two other schools in the previous two years, claimed that her acceptance here was more apparent than elsewhere.

A few years ago, when a sorority seemed to be gaining a foothold in the school, the principal contacted the Women's Club which sponsored it. They succeeded in keeping it from becoming effective in the school.

Principal B's Behavior Relating to Community Members

When an irate parent phones to complain about a teacher's action, the nature of the complaint determines the principal's procedure. He refers the parent to the assistant principal for discipline problems, and refers the parent directly to the teacher for a grading problem. Otherwise, he is polite and attempts to satisfy the parent while protecting the teacher. He will call the teacher in for a conference, afterwards, and reveal the result.

When an irate parent phones or visits the school to complain

about the principal's action, he offers a polite but stern front and does not hesitate to defend himself. He will invite the parent to see him in school if the phone result is not an amicable one. The principal is not adverse to admitting to an error on his part, if such be the case.

If an irate parent comes to his office to complain of a teacher's action, he refers the parent to the assistant principal or dean of girls and prefers to leave the room. If the issue is one that has little relationship to student behavior, he may try to settle it with the parent or call the teacher in. In the latter procedure, he may remain for a three way conference but, more likely, he would leave the teacher to work the matter out with the parent.

As with many other procedures, the principal is experimenting with methods of releasing publicity. He currently relies on a teacher representative of school publicity committee. Newspaper releases pertaining to athletics are cleared through the assistant principal. The students perform on a Saturday radio program that includes school news.

He finds no need to veto releases but teachers feel that he would not hesitate to do so if they were in poor taste or detrimental to the school.

The principal's participation in public elections and issues lies somewhere between being moderately active and refraining from getting involved. He is prone to state his election preferences with

school personnel. At one time, he was openly active on school issues but an unpleasant experience has resulted in his assuming a less active role.

The principal contacts parents on matters concerning scholarships, prep schools and other matters of continuing education after graduation, publicity, and primarily about parent assistance to the school through P. T. A. and Dad's Club. The deans or teachers contact parents about most individual student problems.

The principal's means of contacting parents are through the telephone and mail, and through pupils by bulletins and letters. Teachers make their own contacts and utilize home visits as one of their means.

The principal makes use of the P. T. A. in three major areas. The P. T. A. aid is used to interpret school purposes and practices to the community, to cooperate with the school in undertaking a yearly school project, and to plan the school's health program. He is highly interested and active in the yearly project (currently, to improve school-community relations) and P. T. A. aid has previously resulted in financial help to further professional growth.

The principal attends almost all P. T. A. functions and attempts to secure teacher participation by group announcements and bulletins. He does not attempt to coerce teachers into attending meetings.

The principal makes use of lay resource people for many

subject areas, clubs, and assemblies. His most recent use of lay people is in evidence in the home economics program. In a 1950 school evaluation, lay people were brought into the school. On Career Day, business and professional people currently aid the school. Classes visit a nearby courthouse to learn about legal procedures and bank executives visit math classes. These classes also visit the bank.

The decision concerning which community people to ask to assist in the school is based upon the availability of interested lay people. There is no active file for this purpose.

The principal has attempted to use the community to help determine school procedures through suggestions from the band parents, P. T. A., and some P. T. A. participation in an in-service course evaluation. During an open-house night event, the principal asked parents to fill out a questionnaire on school procedures and presented the findings to the faculty.

He makes little use of the community for school curriculum planning although he has initiated such use this year through securing parent participation in the home economics program. P. T. A. leaders have been called in to observe a previous school evaluation and participated in in-service workshops.

The principal makes use of the community for planning special phases of the program through sponsors and coaches who will call on lay people as needs arise for their activities. The Band Parents

Association, P. T. A., Dad's Club and Health Committee are phases of the program where community members engage in planning.

The community is not active in planning school policies except as the principals's talks with parents result in suggestions to the faculty.

For field trips, community members do not actually plan the activities with school personnel except as teachers plan for their groups and as parents participate in special phases of the program. Nor is the community active in pre-planning or regular faculty meetings. There have been very few occasions of the school requesting lay attendance and participation.

The principal is always ready and willing to make speeches in the community and encourages other staff members to do so. He has recommended teachers for making speeches on subjects in which they are proficient.

He actively participates in community organizations through Rotary, Gun and Tackle Club, Red Cross, and the Episcopal Church and is actually a representative of the school in his Rotary activities.

There is little evidence of the existence of parent special interest groups, although teachers stated that his policy, in the event of such groups attempting to influence the school program, would be to tactfully resist the pressure by selling them on the total school program.

On the question of a community organization attempting to

influence the school program, evidence does exist that the Chamber of Commerce tried to influence the principal to sponsor a school beauty contest. He referred the matter to the planning committee and the idea was defeated. This tends to support the contention that the principal usually prefers to delegate decisions to his faculty when community pressure is brought to bear upon him.

The principal passively resists personal opposition in the community from individuals or groups. His behavior consists of ignoring the opposition after securing the support of his faculty and attempting to seek aid from parents friendly with the school.

His delegation of responsibility extends into the area of fund-raising. A faculty member is chosen from a committee to conduct periodic collections upon initiation of the drives from the county authorities. This applies to Red Cross, Community Chest, Cancer, etc. The Band Parents Association conducts its own drives and county regulations prevent students from being active in this activity.

The principal does not conduct formal or systematic evaluations of school-community relations. He did make such an attempt in 1951 with an open-house night questionnaire. At times, he requests evaluations from individual teachers.

Principal C's Behavior Relating to Individual Teachers

The principal utilizes his contact with a teacher's college and

makes use of county job applications in seeking new teachers. He contacts applicants by mail and phone and a personal interview is usually involved in selections. The school utilizes no formal application blanks.

While the principal is usually too much occupied with student, community, and other activities to work with new teachers when school is in session, he does have conferences with them during the pre-planning period and sees to it that they receive a copy of the school policies handbook. With some new teachers, time has permitted him personally to conduct them about the community and school. The pre-planning meetings, the reviewing of policies, and the inclusion of parents in meetings, provide a major portion of the orientation.

Teachers can make appointments to see the principal. His walks about the school grounds, when he chats with teachers, afford another avenue for conferences. He encourages discussion of individual problems during the time just prior to a faculty meeting. If he is free in his office, and the door is open, teachers can walk in at any time. However, some teachers feel that he is exceedingly busy and difficult to get to at times whereas others feel free to phone or call on him at his home.

When a teacher sees the principal about a discipline problem, the principal usually asks first what conclusions he has reached. He then raises questions to encourage teacher decisions. If, as may be

the case, he is requested to send for the student, the offender is given full opportunity to express his side. When time permits, or if the offense merits it, the principal contacts the teacher about the result of the conference with the student.

The principal is very rarely confronted with a teacher's problem of conflict with another teacher. If the teacher permits, he prefers to bring it before the total faculty. On one occasion, he called both teachers together and they reached agreement. When one teacher complained of another one smoking, he told the former that this was not the teacher's concern. On one occasion, a teacher claimed that the principal was inconsistent in allowing the coach to excuse pupils from this teacher's class, although contrary to school policy. The principal later rectified this.

When a teacher sees him about a personal problem, he is usually sympathetic, helps with suggestions should they seek them, and leaves any decision making to the teacher. A teacher having a problem with a master's thesis was aided with significant books and materials. On occasion, when his mood is negative, he does not help teachers.

When a teacher sees the principal about a parent problem, the principal either helps the teacher reach his own decision prior to the teacher seeing the parent, or he brings both parties together. When in a conference, his role is that of an arbitrator. His teachers feel that he pleases parents wherever possible but, if teachers acquaint him with

a justifiable stand, he'll back them to the limit. On one occasion, a teacher brought a demotion problem to his attention and mentioned the parent's dissatisfaction. After discussing it with the teacher, he called the parent in to explain the necessity for this action. Toward the close of each year he reviews reporting and promotion problems with teachers who wish it.

When a teacher sees the principal about a problem involving school policy, the principal tends to remind him that a teacher cannot change policy as it is a result of faculty decision. He suggests that the teacher bring the problem before the faculty. If he is in agreement with the suggestion, he may bring it before the faculty, himself.

If the problem the teacher approaches him with involves instruction, he tends to supply as much direct aid as the situation calls for. He is almost always ready to help.

The principal's method of determining what his teachers are teaching is to have each teacher turn in a weekly lesson plan at the beginning of the week.

He learns of the methods teachers utilize from three sources: discussions with teachers about their desire for suggestions from him, teacher lesson plans, and casual talks with students.

The principal does not formally observe his teachers in the classroom. The only evidence of his having any need to visit classes was his desire to see a teacher about something pertinent at the

moment. On occasion, when visiting a teacher to deliver a message, he has taken over the class for a few brief moments to confront them with trick problems. When his classroom stay is an extended one, he enters freely into discussions. In his attempts to help teachers improve their work, weekly lesson plans are distributed to all. He has initiated and maintained child study groups and encouraged teachers to experiment. To help build the agriculture, music, and sports programs, he dismisses students from other classes and makes personal efforts to see that they get needed equipment. The principal frequently distributes collected reading materials to teachers.

There is no evidence of any formal rating of teachers. The principal does not have conferences with teachers for the purpose of revealing his evaluations of them.

While some teachers felt that little or nothing is done by the principle to reward good work done by teachers, most teachers indicated that he expressed individual appreciation by bulletins or through personal talks. In faculty meetings he has complimented the group, at large, and encouraged individual teachers to present reports or findings that gain them recognition.

There is adequate agreement from all the evidence to the effect that the principal utilizes the daily bulletins as a means of punishing teachers for actions he considers annoying or harmful. At times, he has reprimanded the faculty in meetings, and, on rare occasion,

has admonished a teacher personally or by note. While the bulletins rarely mention the name of the offender, they are easily identified by other teachers. He reprimanded the faculty in a bulletin for lack of interest in the child study program. The reprimands are not vigorous but present his feelings of embarrassment and disappointment.

The principal has not dismissed any teachers in recent years. Those who have not remained have vacated the positions by their own choice.

Teachers have rarely made private suggestions to the principal about the school, as a whole. On such occasions, he was a good listener and usually referred them to the faculty or committee responsible. Teachers have learned from this procedure that such suggestions were fruitless when brought to his private attention and brought them to the attention of the total faculty.

When a teacher's private suggestion to the principal involves the teacher making the suggestion, he tends to go along with it as long as it does not disrupt the activities of others. Otherwise, he suggests bringing it before the faculty.

A teacher rarely opposes his ideas or methods. He is firm about his way of work and his methods of getting teachers to bring issues before the total faculty does not result in open opposition. The technique he utilizes is one of repeatedly explaining his views. If this does not suffice, he may suggest that the teacher think about it more

fully.

When an individual teacher opposes the group's decision, the principal invariably stands by the group decision. If this is done in a faculty meeting, "He throws the opposing idea back to the group and attempts to reach consensus by playing a moderating role." If the teacher states his opposition in private, the principal tells him that the group decision must hold. The principal usually suggests that his recourse is to bring his point before the total faculty.

He protects teachers from outside pressures during the school day by enforcing a policy of having outsiders see him prior to consulting with teachers. He will not permit them unnecessarily to interrupt school routine and, if seeing a teacher is warranted, he arranges for this when it is convenient for the teacher. The secretary helps enforce this, both on the phone and in face-to-face contacts with visitors. She lets the outsider know when it is convenient to call back or return.

Teachers believe that the principal attempts to protect them from individual parent pressure by his procedure of explaining to parents the reasons for certain grades or bases for promotion or demotion -- if necessary, arranging a three way conference when the situation lends to this. He is adept at explaining school policy and reasons for teacher behavior or action in two or three way conferences.

There is no evidence of pressures from parent or community groups and the evidence obtained from observations and most teacher

interviews reflects that the high quality of school-community relations accounts for harmony. The principal's action is preventive in that he makes teachers aware of their need to build good parent relationships and understand the parents' views.

The secretary's preparation for working with pupils and community members consists of the principal's personal work with her in addition to including her in all faculty and school meetings. She formerly taught in the high-school commercial department.

While there is no evidence to the effect that custodians or bus drivers are part of the school program, some does exist with relation to drivers in that they are prepared to give first aid to children in emergencies.

Principal C's Behavior Relating to Teachers as Groups

While the principal has never attempted to discourage teachers from joining organizations that he believes are harmful, his prime action to encourage teachers to join professional organizations is exhibited through reminders in faculty meetings and bulletins. Much of this responsibility is shared with teachers through active members urging others to join and the fact that the school representative collects dues and urges membership. The principal's role indirectly has an effect upon these encouraging factors in the eyes of teachers and researchers. Some teachers feel that his encouragement actually results

in pressure to join.

The assignment of extra-class activities is shared by the principal with the teachers. At a pre-planning committee meeting, the previous year's activities are listed on the board. The principal secures volunteers for the activities and teachers usually choose the same ones, although they need not. A teacher can initiate an activity of his own. The principal leads and teachers volunteer to cover the assignments.

The procedure for determining class and grade schedules is much the same with the principal leading the committee when the group experiences difficulty but not directing it in any strict sense. The committee makes up a rough skeleton and volunteers fill it in. When the group reaches an impasse, it calls on the principal to help and his presence, in addition to group pressure on individuals, resolves the assignment coverage. Schedules are determined, in part, by students (and parents through them) requesting programs in June. The elementary teachers determine their own schedule. The principal participates.

The evidence on determining the use of internal funds leads to the generalization that teachers decide this for themselves. Interviews revealed that funds are earmarked for the sponsor securing the money. Examples cited were the library and sports program.

The principal is not too social in his daily relationship with teachers, finding little time to see them due to a heavy schedule that he imposes on himself. He tries to be one of the group, but is too busy.

They consider him as being "usually polite but strictly business." However, after school hours, he is considered "very sociable and he stops being the principal." He joins teachers in such activities as movies, picnics, and general evening gatherings at homes. He attempts to spread himself equally among them although community activities prevent his seeing any of them frequently.

The principal gives no indication of preference in lunch companions. He is likely to sit with anyone. He often eats in his office during conferences so as to crowd more working time into his schedule. When eating lunch in the cafeteria or a nearby establishment, he often sits near or at the end of the table.

The agenda for faculty meetings is usually set by the principal but teachers may share in the process. The principal's role consists of his listing items he considers important, (e. g., administrative, routine matters of general concern requiring faculty decisions, etc.) Teachers, on the other hand, may introduce matters of concern and can and do call meetings when they feel a need to (decisions required or announcements pertaining to CTA, school yearbook, etc.).

The principal's participation in faculty meetings consists of being an active leader, encouraging group discussions and decisions ("Let's hear from the rest of you" and voting), and dismissing the group when he feels that issues are resolved. He presides from the front desk of the room with teachers usually seated in a row or semi-

circular arrangement. The need for a faculty committee is determined by principal and staff. Pre-planning committee work is determined in faculty meetings. The principal is usually the one to make the suggestion.

Whereas there is no planning committee, the principal's work with other committees in pre-planning period has been observed by researchers and described by teachers. His role is that of a resource person moving from group to group, spending the most time where teachers request it. While his status permits him to lead, the only evidence of his exercising direct leadership took place in the scheduling committee after an impasse had been reached. During the school year, committees are less active and the principal confines more of his participation to requests by committees.

The total faculty and the committees, rather than the principal, determine committee functions and that of each committee member, as well.

Teachers volunteer for committee assignments and, when relevant issues arise, bring in parents and members of the student council.

Committee reports are presented to the faculty by their respective chairmen for discussion and vote. Should a recommendation be one that the principal does not consider to be in the best interests of the school, he speaks up as a member of the group. Voting decides -- his represents one vote -- and he has been voted down.

The principal does not directly determine when a committee, or the total faculty, is ready to make a decision. All concerned are usually governed by a majority agreement or a time factor. The nature of the committee work determines the consideration of the time element. They either reach their goals on their own initiative or the principal's personal leadership and presence serves to speed up the process.

School policies are reviewed yearly in pre-planning by a committee. The principal is an ex-officio member of the committee and the student council and homeroom mothers pass on committee recommendations that concern them. Conflicts and recommendations are brought back to the total faculty.

Teacher interviews and observations reveal little evidence of the principal violating school policies. He has requested students for activities from classwork, contrary to agreements not to do so, and has found this the most difficult policy to adhere to. Whereas teachers out-voted his suggestion for child study groups last year, his pressure resulted in acceptance this year. Their vote determined the issue, yet most teachers consider him responsible. (It is difficult to ascertain whether this constitutes policy violation.) If the principal violates a policy, he or teachers tend to bring them up at meetings for review and the principal explains his actions. Although he is not consistent in his behavior, he has permitted faculty votes to effect policy changes in regard to such issues.

When the faculty questions his decisions, he states his position, returns the issue to group discussion, and goes along with the resulting reaction. One such issue resulted in committee study for future faculty decision.

The principal's usual procedure in dealing with teachers who violate school policy is to refer to the violation in his morning bulletins. While he usually refers to the group or individuals without direct identification, at times he will be direct, depending upon the nature of the violation and his mood of the moment.

In his attempts to promote experimental work, the principal encourages the use of interns, utilizes child study groups, and distributes summaries to all teachers of what is taking place in each classroom. Each teacher submits a rough weekly plan of what he is doing in advance.

The principal makes little or no effort to establish subject standards, himself. There is little evidence of his directly attempting to do so. Indirectly he affects standards by the utilization of standardized testing, the sharing of weekly lesson plans, and providing much in the way of materials.

His behavior pertaining to course offering or content is revealed by his having students fill out their desired programs for the coming year and suggesting to teachers who wish to add a course that they approach students on the subject. The sharing of weekly lesson

plans may well be considered a method of the principal's to promote content change, in addition to his behavior in fostering experimental work.

When a school wide discipline problem occurs that teachers or the principal identify, the matter is usually referred by the principal to the student council and faculty for action.

There is no evidence of the principal's fostering total faculty evaluations of their progress. Nor are there any formal evaluations made of program changes although teachers have asserted that the principal has discussed changes with them in faculty meetings. Evaluations usually take the form of the principal referring to the school philosophy when faculty thinking appears to part with it.

While the principal has not attempted formal evaluations of school human relations, as problems of this nature arise, he tends to bring them into open discussion in faculty meetings or in conferences with student groups.

Principal C's Behavior Relating to Students

When a teacher tells the principal about the misbehavior of a student, he usually discusses it with the teacher and requests that the student be sent to him for a conference. Because of his emphasis on their understanding of students (emphasized by his faith in the value of child study groups), teachers do not refer such matters to him unless

they consider the misbehavior serious.

He attempts to counsel rather than punish but, as a last resort, may punish or call for a three way conference to include the teacher or parent. If the student has not been a chronic offender, he attempts to get the student to suggest a possible course of action. Teachers usually initiate such requests. At times, after contacting the student, he seeks out the teacher to discuss results and possible further thought or action.

When the principal observes a student infraction and no teacher is present, he may reprimand the student in a quiet, firm manner. If possible, he prefers to send for the student later in the day so as not to embarrass him.

Students and teachers feel that it is rare that in a similar situation, a responsible teacher present fails to act. In these situations, he tends to ignore the occurrence for the moment and send for the student and teacher later for separate conferences. He has been known to make an indirect reference to the situation in a bulletin the following day.

There is little evidence of any teacher's class getting out of hand. Teachers and students testify that, in one such situation, he visited the class to discuss the misbehavior with the students and saw the teacher in a private conference in an effort to help him evaluate the problem.

When the misbehavior of a group of students away from school is reported to him, the degree of seriousness determines his action. He might ignore it or casually discuss the situation with students. If the problem is serious enough, he calls the group of students to his office to explain their view of what took place. They then "feel ashamed." If the group involved is large, or if the offense is serious, he is likely to bring the problem up at chapel service.

When he personally observes misbehavior away from school, if it is not in relation to a school function, he might well ignore it. Otherwise he would say, "Please behave yourselves."

The principal welcomes pupil suggestions involving the school and often helps them look into the issues. He usually refers the students to the student council. When a suggestion is made involving the pupil, personally, he tends to discuss it and follow through with the possibilities. Many older students feel that he treats them as he would his own children and they prefer to see him about personal problems in preference to other adults. Some have invited him to their parties at home.

Students and teachers are agreed that the principal has fun with school youngsters while letting them indirectly know that he is still the school head. Students feel that he is fatherly in his personal-social relationships, frequently shooting baskets with them and accepting invitations to their events and parties.

The principal brings students into planning with him on "most

any school problem." Some examples are assembly programs, club programs for the community, cafeteria problems, publicity releases, and Career Day. He encourages much pupil-teacher planning and refers the responsibility for much planning with pupils to activity sponsors.

In his planning with students, the principal's role is that of an advisor who helps guide the group. However, he does not usually lead. A student is generally the official leader and the principal will not usually enter into planning unless he is requested to.

When pupils make a decision that he believes to be detrimental to their best interests, the principal tends to confer with the group and point out what he conceives the consequences to be. After such discussions, they perceive his points.

Aside from planning, he shares such activities with pupils as basketball, directing church choir and other singing activities, tutoring and driving them to and from sports events and field trips. He teaches one class daily and manages to attend most student social functions during the school day.

Student rules and regulations were arrived at by the student council with staff approval and appear in a student handbook.

Student talent or labor is utilized in the school, for the band, choir, and individual singing and instrumental performances in assemblies, showing visitors about the school, and clerical help in the office. Seniors are used in a child leadership program to teach physical

education to elementary grade students. The boy patrol helps police the highway during school hours.

Outside of school, the band and choir perform in the community and at other schools. A girl and boy perform in county and state functions, she as a singer, he as a public speaker. Agriculture students are used to clean the church grounds and beautify the cemetery.

The needs of the situation determine when students will be utilized and the activity sponsors, as well as the principal, help determine which students will be utilized. Student talent is obtained on a voluntary basis and the talent and ability of participants determine the selective factor.

In his conference procedure with a parent and pupil in dealing with a promotion-demotion problem, the principal tries to include the teacher and play a non-directive role. He frequently asks, "What would you do?" All decisions are usually arrived at in a mutual manner. He has been known to make the decision when it proves difficult to support the teacher, and has permitted six week trial periods in situations where agreement has been difficult to reach.

His procedure in dealing with such conference problems as future education, school transfer, or future vocation has been described as above with, perhaps, more direction and advice given on the basis of the information he possesses. In these conferences he is less likely to include a teacher.

In parent-pupil conferences concerning discipline, the principal will usually uphold his teachers' views when the situation does not go beyond these three. However, frequently, the principal will hear out the parent and pupil, call the teacher into the discussion, and play an arbitrate role, usually helping them reach a decision. Teachers usually request such conferences through the principal who, at times, encourages the teacher to deal directly with the parent.

When a pupil-teacher problem about promotion or demotion confronts him, he generally backs the teacher. However, regardless of achievement, if the child is much older than his group, he tends to favor promoting on a social basis. When parents disagree with such decisions, he suggests six week trial periods. At times, if a parent is insistently opposed to social promotion, such pressure may alter his desire to back a teacher's decision. In the upper grades, achievement plays a slightly more important role and the teacher is almost always supported.

If a discipline problem is serious, the principal usually has a conference with the parent and pupil (as related above). He tends to secure from others statements of their position and helps them reach a mutual decision. While this procedure usually serves to back the teacher, should disagreement still ensue, he will not hesitate to openly support the teacher if the situation warrants it.

Students feel that conferences with the principal that involve

more than two students fall into two categories: planning (related above) and discipline (he listens and tells, leaving them to evaluate their positions). In any case, they feel that they depart having made their own decisions.

There is little evidence of social cliques in the school. Of thirty-three students interviewed (some in groups, others individually) only four could accept the existence of any form of a clique or faction. Two mentioned these in terms of a high achievement group and two inferred (although they did not state so) that economic background resulted in an in-group. One of the four stated that such a group is no longer in existence but "broke it up themselves." Teachers and students are in agreement that the activity program of the school helps offset the need for cliques.

Principal C's Behavior Relating to Community Members

When an irate parent phones the principal to complain about a teacher's action, he suggests that the parent come to school for a three-way conference that includes the teacher. If he is familiar with the problem or feels that the parents may not make the effort to confer with the teacher, the principal tends to back the teacher. He usually refuses to discuss the problem without the teacher's presence.

When an irate parent phones the principal to complain about an action of his, the principal prefers to hear the parent out until such

times as he can tactfully represent his views and convince the parent of his interest in all students. He holds his ground when he feels justified. He follows the same procedure when the parent visits his office.

When an irate parent comes directly to the principal's office to complain of a teacher's action, the principal will not discuss the issue until it is convenient for the teacher to be present.

The principal's behavior regarding school publicity is marked by his personal efforts to write and distribute a newsletter (bulletin). In this venture, he has conferred with individual students for information. He sends the bulletins home by classroom distribution. Activity sponsors and the student council secretary may call the local newspaper about school releases as does the Publications Club which consolidates school news. Some publicity is released from high school departments and the principal releases some orally by lectures to all community churches.

Publicity releases emanate from students, teachers, and the principal. Most releases are cleared through his office.

While the principal does not usually participate in public elections, he is open about his preferences in the high school class he teaches. Otherwise, he is "just a voter." His participation in public issues is realized through the fact that much of the community activity revolves about the school which, in turn, leads to a high extent of influence on issues affecting the school.

The principal contacts parents frequently for such activities as P. T. A. meetings, health council, calendar planning, grades, discipline, special events, and committee volunteers. He recently contacted parents to view a student eye and ear testing program and to help house a visiting group.

The principal utilizes the telephone, the mail, and, primarily, children as his means for contacting parents. He also makes home visits.

He makes use of the P. T. A. for explaining the purpose of the school program, improving relations with the community, financial aid, and special school projects. He attends all P. T. A. functions.

The principal is active in encouraging teacher attendance at P. T. A. meetings through faculty meetings and morning bulletins. Although teachers are free to determine whether they will attend, he stresses the importance of teacher attendance to community members and may, at times, let a teacher know, personally, that he was missed at a meeting by a personal note.

Evidence of principal behavior resulting in the use of lay resource people in the program appears in seniors being responsible for Career Day and planning with the principal as to which lay specialists may be obtained. Other examples are furnished by the agriculture teacher working with farmers who serve for one year in a resource capacity and the use of representative organizations for planning the

yearly school calendar. In addition, one community member assumes responsibility for a student group learning about telegraphy; mothers administer eye and ear examinations in the school; and members of the health and recreation committees are utilized in the program. Other active lay people include insurance men, a minister, and a banker.

In addition to the principal, teachers and students are active in determining which lay people to call upon. However, the principal is the most active one in calling for community assistance and he attempts to select people whom he feels, because of his past experience in working with them, can best help. Some faculty members believe that he tends to secure those who are in agreement with his desires for program change.

The principal uses the community for determining school procedures by securing lay participation in pre-planning. In this way, they influence the calendar program, policies, philosophy, and decisions made by the student council. He does not use the community for curriculum planning although lay people do plan special phases of the program and participate in a P. T. A. study course.

Lay participation in school planning is in evidence in many special phases of the program: recreation and sports, health council, field trips and parties, and band.

He makes use of community participation in forming school policies by having homeroom mothers and other community representatives

pass on them after the faculty has worked with policies in pre-planning. When a policy is formed or changed, the result is brought before the faculty and student council.

While the principal is only partially active in using the community for planning field trips, his initiative has led to their participation. He has fostered the use of farmers to plan trips and has led the way for community participation on policy matters involving school trips. Teachers, for the most part, attend to the responsibility of securing community cooperation for routine field trip planning.

The principal makes frequent speeches in the community and is usually ready to accept such invitations, although an active schedule prevents his fulfilling all requests. He encourages teachers to follow a policy of accepting those that help school relations.

The principal actively participates in such community organizations as the Lions Club, Health Council, and all churches. He represents the school at the Lions Club and does so, indirectly, at the Health Council through two secondary and two elementary teacher representatives.

When parent groups attempt to influence the school program, he does not oppose them unless he or the teachers have strong feelings and evidence to oppose the suggested change. An example provided was that of a farmer group, that wished to set up an agricultural program. The principal acceded to it.

His behavior is somewhat similar regarding a community organization attempting to influence the program. A church group has opposed school attempts to include dancing as an activity and the principal acceded. However, the church also opposes smoking by feminine faculty members yet he does not attempt to inhibit the teachers. The degree of pressure appears to determine his behavior since, at one time, no female teachers smoked on school property. Two teachers led the way in recent years and the principal has defended their stands.

There is little or no evidence of personal opposition to the principal from community members or groups. Teachers feel that "he would tackle or smooth out" any such opposition.

He is an active fund-raiser and his behavior in this activity includes delivering speeches before the P. T. A., Lions, and other groups. In seeking funds, he also talks with influential lay people and distributes bulletins to teachers. In the bulletins, he reminds teachers "not to fall short" and has, on one occasion, requested that teachers assess students ten cents for a Red Cross drive. He suggested that they utilize class funds to compensate for pupils who cannot contribute. The student council has been active in planning and executing fund-raising drives. While most in-school drives are initiated by pupils and teachers, the principal initiates some with them.

The principal's method for evaluating school-community relations is an informal one. At faculty meetings he frequently discusses

the ethics and obligations of the school to the community and its organizations. With teacher and parent groups he frequently stresses "working together with" and encourages parents to discuss their individual feelings with him.

Principal D's Behavior Relating to Teachers as Individuals

The principal utilizes three sources to secure new teachers and follows up his initial screening by personally interviewing the prospective staff members. He relies upon contacts at a teacher training institution, personal recommendations from his staff, and applications on file in his office.

To help orient the new teacher, the principal encourages him to visit his office about problems and gets around the building frequently so as to be available "on the spot." He encourages questions from them at faculty meetings ("How are the new teachers coming along?") early in the year. Two new teachers believe that "most teachers help others naturally." Much of the latter takes place in pre-planning departmental committees and faculty meetings. New teachers are provided with a school handbook and other helpful materials by the principal.

The principal makes himself accessible to all teachers for conferences by helping them feel free to enter the office at anytime of the day and by brief visits, almost daily, to classrooms. They are free to make appointments in advance.

When a teacher sees the principal about a discipline problem, the principal utilizes one of three procedures. He knows the backgrounds of almost all the students and, in talking with the teacher, may supply data to aid him. If this does not suffice, the teacher may be requested to bring the pupil to the office for a three-way conference. The principal listens to the pupil's views and tends to back the teacher. At times, the teacher merely sends the pupil to the office, in which case the pupil may be scolded or punished for the misbehavior by the principal.

Although a teacher rarely finds the need to see the principal about a conflict with another teacher, when this occurs the situation is dealt with by one of three practices. The principal may merely listen and advise by pointing up the strengths of the second teacher; he may bring both parties in to help them settle it; or he may see the second teacher, after talking with the first, and suggest a means of cooperation. The last named procedure once resulted in the principal bringing the issue before the faculty since the problem was one of concern to others.

When a teacher sees the principal about a personal problem, he listens and makes suggestions if the teacher shows indication of wishing this. This is the same behavior exhibited when the teacher is concerned about a parent problem. If the situation warrants it, the principal will advise. If the principal cannot go along with the individual teacher's request, he will explain his reasons.

When a teacher sees the principal about an instructional problem, he may help by supplying available reading material on the subject or advise on the basis of his past experience. When he finds the problem to be one out of his scope, he directs the teacher to whomever else may be of help. (The music and physical education teachers are specific sources of referral furnished by the evidence.)

In dealing with individual teacher problems of any other nature, the principal's behavior is described as one of listening and suggesting. Teachers are in agreement as to his ability to "come up with the right answer."

The principal, by sitting in on departmental meetings of teachers learns what his teachers are teaching. His brief, frequent classroom visits and casual conversations with students and teachers also serve this purpose. These procedures serve the purpose of the principal in determining teaching methods, as well.

The most frequent reasons for the principal's visits to classrooms are to perform minor tasks so he can converse with the teacher (delivering a text, conveying a message, etc.) and to comply with requests from teachers and pupils for his observations of units of their work. He will also visit classrooms that are noisy.

When the principal visits a classroom, he may chat briefly with the teacher, talk with the group about their current work, or merely walk about the room to see what the children are doing and discuss

their individual work with them. Infrequently he may take a seat to observe a lesson or discussion and/ or talk with the class about a school-wide behavior problem.

Other methods by which the principal assists teachers in their teaching are faculty meeting discussions about what some teachers are doing, helping teachers feel free to see him for help, and making available aids, materials, and resource people. Two years prior to this study, teachers participated in an in-service, child study group program.

When a teacher does not request help to improve his work, the grade meetings furnish the principal with an opportunity of providing assistance. By having teachers evaluate what they've been doing, the principal is in a position to encourage them and make further suggestions.

While the principal does not formally rate his teachers, he provided evidence of his personal evaluative criteria by listing the following as measures of a good teacher (not in any order or priority):

- (1) Joining up-and-coming professional organizations
- (2) Sharing in meetings; formal and informal
- (3) Pupil-teacher planning that focuses on good discipline, assignments, pupil participation, and materials
- (4) Working well with parents
- (5) Handling groups well in moving about the building
- (6) Having pupils assume responsibilities and learn work habits

(7) Being a good classroom housekeeper

He utilizes student and teacher statements to supplement his own observations. These mental evaluations are not disclosed to teachers.

The most usual reward for a teacher doing a good job is the principal's procedure of privately saying so or telling him of some good things he has heard from others. One teacher's reward is being taken into the confidence of the principal and being called by his first name. Others receive theirs by the manner in which the principal compliments a class.

When a teacher does something the principal considers annoying or harmful to the school, the principal often refers to it indirectly by scolding the teacher's class. This is his method of letting the teacher know he is not performing well. If the offenses are serious, he will talk directly to the teacher. "If they can't do a good general job of teaching, dismissal may be necessary."

The principal does not suddenly dismiss a teacher as the teacher usually knows what is expected of him and the extent to which he is accepted by the principal. When a teacher's behavior is unsatisfactory, it is pointed out to him. He will not be dismissed without several indications of the principal's dissatisfaction. On one occasion, the principal requested that a supervisor observe a teacher as a check on the principal's evaluation and, on another occasion, a teacher was told in advance that he would not be recommended so that he might resign.

When a teacher makes a private suggestion to the principal involving the school as a whole, he listens and, if acceptable to him, will bring it up at a faculty meeting. If the idea is one that is not workable in the eyes of the principal, he will explain his reasons to the teacher for rejecting it.

When the suggestion made by the teacher involves the teacher, personally, the principal either lets him try it out or explains why it should not, or cannot, be acted upon.

When a teacher opposes an idea or method of the principal's, his reaction is based upon how the majority of the faculty views it. If he feels that others agree with him, he'll restate his position to the teacher and ignore the opposition. If others might be favorable to the individual teacher, the principal tends to bring the issue before the faculty and go along with their decision. There is very little opposition but, what little there has been, has been summarized by teachers as "compromised or reconciled" by the principal. Observations support this.

Should a teacher oppose the decisions or thinking of the group, the principal usually tells him that he must go along with the majority. He may add that it is the place for all to "see if it works first." At times, if the principal agrees with the dissenter, the principal may have the faculty reconsider the decision.

The principal attempts to protect teachers from outside

pressures during the school day by not permitting solicitors or parents to see teachers except by appointment. (This procedure was even extended to researchers during this study although it was not vigorously enforced throughout the period of study.) A teachers' lounge is provided for teachers where pupils and outsiders may not enter. Teachers are not interrupted for phone calls except in cases of emergency. Of the numerous supporting examples of this protection, a characteristic one took place when the principal supported a group of teachers for being late to county meetings held during the school day. He went so far as to assert he'd always protect them on such issues.

Teachers have been protected from pressures emanating from individual parents by the principal's practice of supporting teachers' actions whenever possible. There have been occasions when a complaining parent came to the office and the principal sent word to the teacher involved to leave the building while the parent was detained. When a group of parents exert pressure on a teacher, if the principal agrees with the teacher, he makes every effort to support him.

There is little evidence of pressures having been brought to bear on teachers from any parent or community group. Teachers and investigators agree that the relative absence of such situations has been due to the principal's reputation of meeting most problems promptly and directly.

The principal's method of preparing the secretary for her work

with pupils and community members has been to help her with problems as they arise. He tries to follow the policy of letting her know in advance of pending incidents or conferences with parents and keeps her as well briefed as possible about current school issues.

The principal has extended responsibility and authority to the custodian in efforts to make him a part of the school program. He is introduced to new teachers as "our best helper." He often serves as a counselor of the pupils. He is included in such school activities as socials and assemblies and shares many discussions with the principal during the school day.

There is no evidence that the bus driver is made a part of the school program.

Principal D's Behavior Relating to Teachers as Groups

The principal has never attempted to discourage teachers from joining any organizations. He does attempt to secure yearly membership in professional organizations by encouraging this through faculty meetings. He has stated, "I think you all should join," in his efforts to secure 100% membership but does not single out exceptions. Total faculty membership is usually attained and this provides a basis of precedent for maintaining teacher membership.

Extra-class activities are assigned by committees formed on a departmental basis. The principal has a large share in determining the

assignments but precedence usually determines the assignments. Teachers rotate some assignments, themselves, on an alphabetical basis.

While teachers usually teach on the same grade levels each year, some request available openings and the principal grants them whenever possible. Most vacancies are filled by new teachers unless a veteran teacher requests a change.

The principal utilizes internal funds primarily on the basis of teacher request. He helps them individually when he feels funds are available. Long range needs are referred to county funds. The Ways and Means Committee of the P. T. A. raises funds for specific school purposes.

The principal's personal-social relations may be described as business-like with an air of friendliness and humor when possible. There is no status dividing line in the smoking room and teacher conversations do not necessarily focus about the principal. He has attended many Friday afternoon teacher parties.

He is highly sociable in his relationships with teachers after school hours and has open house for most teachers. (New teachers do not share this feeling.) He has very close relationships with four or five teachers whom he has known for many years but manages to socialize with all at one time or another during the school year.

The principal eats lunch with any and all teachers and intentionally seats himself so as not to favor one or more of them. He eats

with pupils as frequently as he does with staff members.

The agenda for the faculty meeting is derived from three sources, two of them planned by the principal. One meeting, deliberately set for the Monday following the county staff meeting, serves to determine part of the faculty agenda. A second planned source is the principal's administrative routine. Remaining matters of discussion stem from issues raised by teachers.

The principal's participation in a faculty meeting is characterized by his role as presider and stater of questions and issues. Others talk as much or more than he. His behavior may be described as mild, never speaking above a conversational tone, and pervasive.

Seating at faculty meetings is informal and the principal may be found in most any seat. Chairs are usually in a circular arrangement.

The principal calls for departmental committee meetings about four times a year (for Christmas and May Day projects, pre-planning and post-planning periods). Exceptions rarely arise, but tradition has been the main factor in determining the need for the committees.

The principal does not utilize a faculty planning committee or council. His role in working with other committees is that of an ex-officio member who is available when called upon for answering questions and making suggestions. He feels free to participate in all departmental committees but is not chairman of any.

The function of each committee is usually set by precedent. The

principal generally outlines what has been and should be done in a faculty meeting and the total faculty then makes additions or changes. They appear to know what to do because of the committee members' experience of the previous year.

The functions of individual members are also determined, primarily, by previous experience. Since committees are formed by departments, groups are fairly constant. While they are usually free to select their chairman, the principal will, at times, suggest one. In part, precedence, volunteering, and principal recommendations all enter into the determination of committee functions, individual functions, and memberships of committees.

No present committee work deals with reports or recommendations for the school as a whole although faculty meetings have resulted in informal suggestions pertaining to work done in committees. Committee reports from departmental groups are made at faculty meetings. Few issues arise and discussions, followed by voting, resolve them.

Committee decisions are not delayed by extended discussions. The committees' time for decisions are determined by the calendar.

The policies are usually set by the principal, some as a result of his own experience, others as the result of talking them over individually with others (primarily older teachers whom the principal has learned to place confidence in). Policies are available in a handbook distributed to all teachers and, to some extent, have emerged from the

total faculty. The principal maintains and has utilized his veto power.

The principal rarely deviates from these policies. The exception in evidence is a policy that the enrollments for classes are determined on random bases but the principal has, at times, placed a youngster with or away from a certain teacher. This deviation occurs when a parent expresses a strong desire that his child be transferred to another class. While the principal attempts to keep these changes to a minimum, they are policy violations. He later explains his reasons for such changes to the teachers concerned.

There is little evidence that the faculty questions decisions made by the principal. The principal has a manner of making a decision in faculty meetings that do not appear to be stated as decisions. Opposition is forestalled by the principal's ability to compromise issues. He will be receptive to change only if it appears that his faculty appears to be in opposition to his judgment.

When a teacher violates school policy, the principal finds a tactful way of reminding him of it or, as alternative, makes reference to the violation in an office bulletin without mentioning his name.

The principal exhibits enthusiasm for experimental work, provided that it is within school policy and, in his opinion, has been working well or has a good chance of success. He tries to foster it by earmarking money for this purpose. The policy of not permitting overnight camping during the regular school year is an example of his

discouragement of experimental work.

The principal establishes subject standards through the use of school-wide standard achievement tests given in arithmetic, language, spelling, and reading.

Very little is done to bring about changes in classroom content. When a new idea appeals to the principal and one or more teachers, he may attempt to secure a budget appropriation to support it.

The most usual procedure employed by the principal in his attempts to solve school-wide discipline problems is to bring it before the whole school at the weekly chapel service. Accompanying this method, the principal may bring it up at a faculty meeting. On one occasion he moved from room to room, said something about another subject, and followed this up with a request to improve school-wide behavior.

The principal does not usually employ any direct means of getting his total faculty to evaluate their progress. Individuals, in response to their Christmas and May Day programs, may discuss their reactions at faculty meetings. At the end of each year, department committees discuss their own progress and, during the year, the principal will frequently refer the staff to its goals, but this is not in the realm of total evaluation.

The principal's means of securing any program change evaluations is exercised through the departmental meetings that take place at

the close of the year.

There is no evidence of evaluations involving human relations in the school.

Principal D's Behavior Relating to Students

When a teacher tells the principal about the misbehavior of a student, the principal discusses it with him and supplies background data. He may leave the teacher to make his own decision or suggest one. At times, the principal will follow this up by having a conference with the student and teacher together and, after hearing the student's version, will tend to support the teacher's decision.

When the teacher sends a student to his office because of misbehavior, the principal usually reprimands the youngster though, at times, he will wait for the teacher so that all three can confer. Repeated misbehaviors usually result in deprivation of privileges. In extreme cases, physical punishment or suspension are resorted to by the principal.

When the principal observes a student infraction, and no teacher is present, he usually acts immediately. The action is usually a cautioning to the student which results in a prompt halt to the misbehavior. It may result in the principal having the student wait for him in his office for discussion, followed by his later mentioning it to the teacher. When the problem has occurred frequently, the principal may

refer to it in the weekly chapel service.

If the student infraction takes place and the teacher responsible is present and fails to act, the principal usually follows one of three procedures, depending upon the severity of the infraction. He may call it to the teacher's attention immediately, correct the student immediately and discuss it with the teacher afterwards, or ignore the matter entirely.

There is no evidence of a class getting out of a teacher's control during the past year. Interviews with students and teachers reveal that the principal's past procedure has been to confer with the teacher and point out the causes of the problem. He then suggests that the teacher evaluate the problem.

When the misbehavior of a group of pupils away from school is reported to him, he usually ignores it. If he personally observes the misbehavior, he is likely to caution the pupils.

Pupils do not make many suggestions to the principal involving the school as a whole. Those that take place usually do in the hallway. The principal will act upon them if he considers them feasible and, if not acceptable, he explains his reasons for rejecting them.

When the suggestion involves the student, personally, the principal tends to question whether the idea is one that might concern others. If feasible, the suggestion is acted upon. He usually gives his reasons for rejecting suggestions.

His personal-social relations with pupils has been described as "strictly business when he feels it necessary to be" and "can be very friendly when time allows." "He usually smiles and nods at students," frequently stopping to chat with them. Pupils are surprised at his ability to recall all names and personal facts about them.

The principal brings pupils into planning with him, on occasion, for the Christmas and May Day band programs. A teacher usually leads the planning session and the role of the principal is that of an advisor.

When pupils attempt to make a decision that the principal believes to be detrimental, he generally explains why it is an unwise one and this suffices to change their intended behavior. However, there is little evidence of opportunity for pupils to be faced with such decisions.

Aside from pupil planning, the principal shares in such activities as the boy patrol, picnics, and parties. Most sharing is haphazard rather than pre-planned.

There is no evidence of a written set of student rules and regulations although, as a result of the principal discussing needs for them as they arise in faculty meetings, the staff is aware of what is expected of students. The principal constantly stresses being thoughtful of and cooperating with others. However, from time to time bulletins contain such restrictions as where youngsters can park and utilize bicycles, and the manner in which students should walk through the halls and cafeteria. The principal sets some of these rules himself, but most result from

total faculty agreements.

The use of student talent and labor in the school program is extended to boy and girl patrols, special choir performances, art shows, plays and other aspects of the Christmas and May Day programs, and helpers in the cafeteria.

Outside of school, the principal makes use of talent for the county art show and spelling competition.

Teachers determine when students shall be used and principal behavior does have an influence on the results of patrol elections in that low grades can eliminate a candidate. Hence, depending upon the situation, talent or ability, elections, and volunteering help determine when and which students will be utilized, and teachers are usually and solely responsible for the resulting choices.

The procedure utilized by the principal for most conferences dealing with problems of promotion or demotion may be listed as follows:

- (1) The teacher's initiative leads to a discussion with the principal.
- (2) The principal contacts the parent
- (3) With records available, a conference with the principal, teacher, and parent takes place in the office
- (4) The principal guides the discussion along the lines of "What do you think is best for the child?"

- (5) The parent is usually guided to a decision that is the intended one of the teacher's.

His role is generally that of an adviser.

Conferences pertaining to problems about future education, transfer of school, and future vocation are not in evidence.

The principal's procedure in conferences with the pupil and teacher over disciplinary problems is usually as follows:

- (1) The principal requests each to describe the problem
- (2) He questions the pupil about why he has behaved as he did and may introduce the fact that the pupil knew the rules or something about the pupil's past behavior that might apply. (Pupils and teachers perceive this as "quiet scolding.")
- (3) The teacher and principal agree on a form of punishment or call for the parent when the behavior is serious or habitual. Otherwise, the pupil generally expresses a desire to improve.

When disciplinary conferences involve a parent, they may either continue from the point outlined above or the procedure may take place as follows:

- (1) The teacher's initiative leads to a discussion with the principal.
- (2) The principal contacts the parent.

- (3) A conference with the principal, parent, and teacher takes place in the office. If a second teacher is familiar with the problem, he may be called into the conference.
- (4) After the principal has guided the discussion to an airing of the full nature of the problem, they call the pupil in.
- (5) The child enters into the discussion and is left with the decision after the principal has presented him with the alternatives. The result is, in reality, that of the principal helping to back up the teacher's decision.

The principal's role in conference with more than one pupil is that of a question raiser. If the nature of the conference is one that involves planning, he tries to ascertain the extent to which pupils are prepared to undertake their responsibilities. If the conference is of a disciplinary character, he raises questions or makes statements such as the following:

"Who caused this?"

"Why did you do it?"

"I don't want you doing this any more."

There is very little evidence of social cliques among pupils.

Principal D's Behavior Relating to Community Members

When an irate parent phones the principal to complain about a teacher's action, the principal lets the parent release his feelings.

Then he prefers to say what he knows about the matter and, if this doesn't satisfy, he requests that the parent come to school for a conference with the teacher. He will see the teacher to be certain of his views prior to a three way conference. This procedure is rarely necessary and usually does not go beyond the phone call since the principal keeps up with most issues involving teachers and clears up misunderstandings himself. He invariably tries to "back the teacher."

When a parent phones to complain about an action of the principal's, his procedure, as stated above, is to listen at length and then explain the reasons for his actions. The principal is convincing. If this does not suffice, he requests that the parent come to school and discuss the matter, in person. He usually convinces the parent of the need for having acted as he did for the welfare of the pupil and the school.

When a parent comes to his office to complain of a teacher's action, the principal tries to explain the teacher's purposes in attempting to protect the teacher. He usually follows this up by calling the teacher in and supporting him.

School publicity is released by the principal through a newsletter and parent's handbook. The material stems from the principal's ideas and faculty meetings. A teacher committee assumes the responsibility for May Day publicity and a P. T. A. publicity chairman assumes the function for that group. All school releases are cleared through the principal.

The principal vetoes releases that he either considers detrimental to the school or objectionable to the county office.

He is active in most public elections to the extent that he votes. He prefers that they "keep politics out of school conversations" but has made exceptions to this. He took a stand in the last county superintendant election and attempted to influence his personal friends and associates.

The principal expresses what he thinks about public issues when opportunities present themselves but he does not often participate publicly. He does not like to make speeches but will contribute his opinions to P. T. A. and social discussions. He participated in discussions on the issue of school legislation at recent meetings.

He finds a need to contact parents at the request of teachers for such problems as serious discipline cases or immediate illnesses of children. Teachers or the principal do their contacting by sending letters or notes to the home through their children. He has, on occasion, used bulletins to parents as a means of letting them know when policies are violated (coming to classrooms too early to call for children) or for any other information that directly concerns them.

In addition to using the telephone, letter, and bulletin handed to children, he will, on rare occasion, make home visits.

The principal makes use of the P. T. A. for interpreting the school program. Other values have been derived in the form of

financial aid, suggestions for bettering the school (although the line is drawn here on policy formation), building better public relations, and educating parents. The latter is accomplished by means of parent study groups.

He attends all meetings of the P. T. A. Teachers decide for themselves whether they will attend. The principal usually informs new teachers that they are expected to attend and all appear to accept this function as a part of their jobs.

The principal utilizes lay resource people for some P. T. A. meetings. The resource people are usually parents in the group, frequently representing a nearby college. Some teachers utilize resource people from the college parents.

In determining which people will be asked, at times the P. T. A. requests those they wish, as do the teachers. Teachers, however, clear through the principal's office prior to making contacts. The principal knows his community members well and prefers to determine which lay people to call on for help.

Parent suggestions represent the only means of utilizing the community for determining school procedures and curriculum planning. The community is not usually used, however.

The only use of the community for planning special phases of the program in evidence lies in parents helping with costumes for plays or other similar activities during the Christmas and May Day periods.

The community is not used by the principal in an organized manner for determining school policies. Parents may make suggestions individually or through P. T. A. discussion. The principal just "knows how most of them feel and think."

Teachers plan field trips with their own parent groups. The principal is not active in this planning nor does he make much use of lay people in faculty meetings.

There is no evidence of the principal having any policy in regard to other teachers making speeches but teachers feel that he would tend to encourage rather than discourage this. Personally, he prefers not to make speeches, but will, on occasion, if pressured to do so.

The principal actively participates in two community fraternal organizations and the church of his preference. He represents the school in the community as a member of the county health advisory council.

His procedure in dealing with parent special interest groups attempting to influence the school program is to gain the support of his teachers and maintain a strong stand. However, this measure is rarely necessary since the principal usually is able to convince such groups that their desires are not in harmony with the total program.

The principal deals with personal opposition from individuals or groups in the community by preventive means. Teachers feel that

he builds his fences so as to be in a position to be secure. He tends to work with teachers so that they wish to back him in the event of any such opposition. When it occurs, he either explains his position, stands his ground firmly, if necessary, or ignores it.

The school fund-raising drives are handled by the principal. He usually requests that most or all funds be dealt with through the Community Chest drive. He initiates it at a faculty meeting so that teachers, in turn, initiate the drive in their own classes. During the annual puppet show, funds are secured by having children pay a fee to observe it. The parents manage their own drives without participation on the part of the principal.

The principal personally evaluates school-community relations by keeping in close contact with all teachers and most parents. At times, teachers will evaluate through a discussion emanating from them at a faculty meeting.

6. Summary

This chapter presented the behaviors of the four school principals studied intensively. The evidence was cross-checked by observations and interviews conducted by seven investigators and was prepared to serve as external criteria for testing the Principal Behavior Check List for external validity.

The case study material was presented in the same order as

the situations provided in the open-ended questionnaire (Form B). Where sufficient evidence or agreement was lacking, the behavior was omitted.

The evidence was used by the investigator to predict the behaviors recorded by the four principals prior to administering the instrument to them.

CHAPTER V

EXTERNAL VALIDITY

A. Overview

The case studies presented in the previous chapter will be the external criteria used to test the instrument for external validity. This chapter will present the methods and results of determining the accuracy of the investigator's predictions based upon the case studies. The predictions will be used to determine correspondence between the actual behavior of the four principals studied intensively and responses to the Principal Behavior Check List made by the principals and selected teachers from the same schools.

Other types of correspondence will be sought. The responses to the instrument made by the principals in the four schools will be compared with the responses made by the selected teachers. Comparisons will be made between responses to the instrument by a principal and selected teachers in a school where the investigator was unknown to school personnel. Interrelationships between the correspondences will be analyzed, as well.

The chapter will be concluded with an analysis of the validity of each question that appears in the instrument and a statement of the reasons for omitting any measure of reliability.

B. Criteria for Establishing Tests for Validity

1. Comparative criteria

Data obtained from many pencil-and-paper research instruments often can be scaled or quantified. When a response can be classified as right or wrong, or when a response can be given a position on a continuum, certain statistical procedures become possible. A single score can be given to the instrument or part of the instrument. This score can be combined with scores of others and such statistics as means, medians, and standard deviations can be calculated. Under proper conditions correlations can be calculated between pairs of scores. Where two groups differ in some statistic based upon such research instruments, it is possible to test the statistical significance of the difference, i. e., is it at the .05 level, or the .01 level?

This study was limited to deriving behaviors without ordering or scaling them (see Chapter I). Since the axioms of measurement could not be fulfilled, statistical procedures like those described above did not apply. Three statisticians and two psychometricians were consulted, personally, and two educators, prominent in the field of test construction, were contacted by mail. None of these specialists felt that they could commit themselves to a procedure for treating the data. The literature revealed methods but all were based upon instrument questions, the responses to which, either were part of a scale or continuum or possessed some degree of values or correctness.

It became necessary for the researcher to devise a procedure that did make sense with the given data. It was decided to calculate per cents of correspondence among the answers reported from the three types of sources: the researcher's own predictions of the principal's behavior based upon the extended observations and interviews presented in the case studies; the composite of selected teachers' reports of principal behavior; and the behavior of the principal reported by the principal himself.

2. Criteria for Determining Correspondence and Validity Percentage.

As discussed in Chapter III, the development of the instrument was designed with a primary purpose of permitting the principal to respond to a universe of possible behaviors and to be able to do so without the restriction of a single response. The attempt to provide a response form in line with the complexity of behavior resulted in an instrument difficult to treat. Part of this difficulty became apparent in the attempt to determine a criterion for correspondence when the respondent signified two or three behaviors for first priority. It was agreed that the following criteria would serve as a reasonable basis for determining the correspondence of any two comparable sets of responses to the instrument.

a. The determination of correspondence would be based upon first priority behaviors. Exceptions would be made where more than one behavior was signified as a first priority. Perfect correspondence

TABLE III

RELATED RESPONSES USED TO TEST INSTRUMENT FOR VALIDITY IN SCHOOL "A"

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Response By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	a-g, l	a-g	1	a-g, c-e-h	1	1
2	a-d, g	a, d	1	a-d-g	1	1
3	a-b, c-d	b, a-c	1	b, a-d-h	1	1
4	h, b, a	h, a	1	a, b-e-f-h	3	3
5	a, b	a, b	1	a, b-g	1	1
6	b-e, d	b-e	1	c, a-e-f	3	3
7	b, a-c-i	a-j	3	b, a	1	3
8	e, a, d	a-c	3	a-d	3	2
9		a-c	X	c	X	1
10	d, b-f	b, d	3	f, b-c-h-m	3	3
11	d-f, e	d, e	2	d-f	1	2
12	c-e	c, e	1	d	3	3

TABLE III (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence	Item Re- sponses By Principal	Case Study Principal Correspondence	Teacher Principal Correspondence
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
13	a-f	a-f	1	a, b-c-d-f	1	1
14	c-f, b	c, b	2	f, e-a	1	3
15	b, g	b	1	b, a	1	1
16	c, d-j	c, a-d	1	c, b-d	1	1
17	g, c, e	g, c	1	e-g, h	2	2
18	b-h, a-f	b, a	2	h-j-k	2	3
19	b, e, g	b, e	1	b	1	1
20	a	a	1	a	1	1
21	e	e	1	e	1	1
22	h, j, k	h, k	1	j	3	3
23	a, b	a, b	1	e, a, b	3	3
24	d, f	d, f	1	e, f-g	3	3
25	a-c, b	a, d	2	b, d, e	3	3

TABLE III (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
26		a, g	X	c, a	X	3
27		a-b-e	X	b, a, d	X	1
28		d, e-h	X	d, e, c	X	1
29		i	X	j, b-c	X	3
30	f-g, d	g, f	1	f, d, g	2	3
31	f, e, a	e-f	1	f, a-e-l	1	1
32	c-a, f	c, e	1	c, b-d	2	1
33	f-h, c-g	f, g-h	1	c-h, f-g-j	2	3
34	i	i	1	k, i	3	3
35	e	e, c-f	1	e-g, f	1	2
36	d-g, b-e	d, g	1	e, d, b	3	3
37	c	c-a	1	c-d, a-e	1	2
38	h, a-c	c-h	1	h, a-d-e	1	2

TABLE III (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
(1)	(2)	(3)				
39		a-g, d	X	e, b-i	X	3
40	a-e, f	a-e	1	a-e-f	1	1
41	e, b-d	b-e	1	k, i-j	3	3
42	b-i, e	b, i	1	a-e-i	2	3
43	f-j, g-k	j, f	1	d-f-g	2	3
44		e, b-e	X	e, e-f	X	1
45	d, k	d-k	1	d, e	1	2
46	i, a-e	i, a-e	1	i, j	1	1
47	b-f, a-h	b-f, h	1	b, h	2	2
48	a, b-c	b, a	3	e, b	3	3
49	a, b	a	1	b-e-d	3	3
50	a, b, c	a-b	1	a, b-e	1	1
51	a, e-f	a-e	1	a, e, f	1	1

TABLE III (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence	Item Re- sponses By Principal	Case Study Principal Correspondence	Teacher Principal Correspondence
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
52	b, a	a, b	3	a-b, c	1	1
53	a-b	a-b-e	1	a-b-g	1	1
54	b, a, c	a-b	1	b, a, c	1	1
55	g	g	1	g	1	1
56	a	a	1	a	1	1
57	d-e, c	d, e	1	e, d	1	3
58	c, a-e	c, a, a	1	a-b, e	3	3
59	e	e-j	1	e	1	1
60	c-g, b-f	b-e-g	1	c-g, f	1	1
61	f, a, h	f-h, a	1	a, f	3	3
62	a-e, f-i	e, f	2	a-e-g	1	2
63	a-g, b	a-g, b	1	a-f-g	1	1
64	b, a	b, d	1	a-b	1	2

TABLE III (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
65	d, e	d, f	1	a-b	1	2
66	a, b	a, b	1	a-i	2	2
67	e-f, j	e, d-j	2	e-f, a-j	1	2
68	h, a	a-h	1	a-3, g	3	2
69	g, d	g, d	1	g, d-h	1	1
70	e-h, c	h, c, e	2	d-e-h	1	2
71	c, d	c	1	d-e	3	3
72		a, i	x	a-j	x	2
73	b-f, c	b, f, e	1	b-h, a-f	2	2
74	i	i	1	i	1	1
75	e, c	e, c	1	e, c	1	1
76	e, k, a	e, k, a	1	e, a-d-k	1	1
77	a	a, g	1	a, f	1	1

TABLE III (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
78	b	b	1	b-e	1	1
79	d, c-h	d, c, h	1	c-d	1	1
80	b-d, a	b-d	1	b-d-h	1	1
81	c, e, a	c, e	1	c-e	1	1
82	h-j, n	j-h	1	h-j-n	1	1
83	d, a	a-d	1	a-d	1	1
84	e	e	1	f-j	3	3
85	h	h	1	a, b-g-h	3	3
86	c	c	1	c, e	1	1
Totals			1 = 66 2 = 7 3 = 5 **X = 8		1 = 48 2 = 10 3 = 20 X = 8	1 = 40 2 = 17 3 = 29
Average Correspondence			= 1.218			
Correspondence Per Cent			= 89.1%			
			= 1.641			
			= 68.0			
			= 1.872			
			= 50.4			

*Correspondence based on first behavior responses.

**Refers to lack of correspondence due to insufficient case study evidence.

would be signified by the number "1" (see Table III, Question 15, Columns 2, 5, 6).

b. Where two or more behaviors were responded to as a first priority, and the comparable response signified no more than one behavior, that behavior corresponding to one of the behaviors in the comparable column, perfect correspondence would be designated (see Table III; Question 3; Columns 2, 5, 6).

c. Where two or more behaviors were responded to as a first priority, and the comparable response signified a first and second priority; if the first and second priorities corresponded to two of the first priority responses in the comparable response, perfect correspondence would be designated (see Table III, Question 2, Columns 3, 5, 7). If the second priority failed to correspond to one of the first priorities in the comparable response, the result would not violate the conditions for correspondence but would be signified by the number "2" (see Table III, Question 11, Columns 2, 3, 4) to designate a partial correspondence.

d. Any results not accounted for by the criteria set forth above would be designated by the number "3" (see Table III, Question 10, Columns 2, 3, 4) to signify a result of unsatisfactory correspondence. The only exception to this would be "X" to signify that the evidence from the research files and cast studies was insufficient and no attempt to establish correspondence was made.

e. Validity percentages were obtained by: (1) recording the totals of the number of 1's, 2's, 3's, and X's separately, in each correspondence column; and, (2) dividing the sum of the number of 1's and one-half of the 2's by the total number of 1's, 2's, and 3's in each column. (The X's were not included since they were apart from the evidence obtained by the investigator and not utilized for predictions of the responses by principals and teachers.)

The method of checking the percentages may help clarify the above explanation. By adding the 1's, 2's, and 3's, numerically, a single total was obtained for each correspondence column. This total was divided by the total number of 1's, 2's, and 3's in each column to provide the "Average Correspondence." By interpolation, the equivalent found between zero and one hundred per cent, of the position of the average correspondence found between 1 and 3, was determined as the "Correspondence Per Cent" (or per cent of validity). An example follows (see Table III, totals at end of Column 4):

The case study-teacher correspondence in School A was perfect in sixty-six situations, i. e., in sixty-six situations a "1" appeared. Partial correspondence (or a "2") resulted in seven situations and unsatisfactory correspondence (or a "3") resulted in five situations. There was a lack of sufficient evidence (or an "X") in eight situations. By discounting the "X's," seventy-eight situations were accounted for in the range of "1's" to "3's." By dividing the sum of perfect

correspondences (sixty-six) and one-half of the partial correspondences (three and one-half) by the number of situations accounted for in the 1 to 3 range (seventy-eight), we arrive at an 89.1 per cent figure.

To check, we add all the numbers in the column and arrive at a total of ninety-five. By dividing by seventy-eight, the average correspondence of 1.218 is revealed in the quotient. The per cent we desire lies proportionately between zero and one hundred as 1.218 lies between 3 (zero correspondence) and 1 (perfect correspondence). Interpolation reveals 89.1 per cent, as above.

C. Case Study-Principal Correspondence

1. Interpretation of the Tables.

Tables III-VI relate the item responses derived from the investigator's predictions and responses by the principals. (The use of selected teachers is discussed in Section D, below.) The numbers and letters correspond to Form C (see Appendix C).

The case study material was reviewed by the investigator who recorded the actual behavior of the four principals previous to reviewing the responses to the instrument made by the principals. Where two or more behaviors were considered equally typical, they were separated by a dash in the prediction (e. g., a-b). Responses from the four principals were recorded in the same manner.

TABLE IV

RELATED RESPONSES USED TO TEST INSTRUMENT FOR VALIDITY IN SCHOOL "B"

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	a-f	a, b	2	f, a	1	3
2	c, h	e, h, g-f	1	e-h, f	1	1
3	b-d	b, d	1	b-e, d-f	2	2
4	b-h, e	h, j	2	c, d	3	3
5	j, e	j, e	1	j, i	1	1
6	e-f, e-g	f, g, e, e	2	e-f, e	1	2
7	e-j	j, i	2	e-j, b, d	1	2
8	f-g, i	g	1	f-g-i	1	1
9		f, a	x	f, e	x	1
10	e-g-k	e, g	1	e-g-k	1	1
11	d, g	d, f, g	1	d-f-g	1	1
12	j	e, a	3	h-j, a	1	3

TABLE IV (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
13	a-h	a, h	1	b-g-h	2	3
14	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	d	d	1	a-d-e	1	1
16	k	k	1	k	1	1
17		e-a	x	e, f	x	1
18	a-j	a, e	2	a-i	2	2
19	a	a-h	1	a-k	1	2
20	d	d, b	1	d	1	1
21	g	g, e-h	1	g, f-h	1	1
22	d	d, e	1	d, e, g	1	1
23		b-d, e	x	e-d, f	x	2
24	e-g	g, e	1	g, f	2	1
25	d-f, b	a, b, d	3	e, a-d-f	3	3

TABLE IV (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponse By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
26	c-d-e	c, d, a	1	d-e	1	3
27	d	d, e, c	1	d	1	1
28	d	d, g	1	d	1	1
29	j, c-1	j, i, c	1	j, d	1	1
30	f-g, d	g, f, d	1	d, f-g	3	3
31	g, f-k	f, a	3	g-l, f-k	2	3
32	c, e	c, e	1	b, a-c-d	3	3
33	c, h	c, j, h	1	c, l	1	1
34	c	c, f, g	1	d-e	1	2
35	e, g	e, g, f	1	e-g, c	1	1
36	d-f	d, e	2	f, e	2	3
37	e, b	e, d	3	a, d, e	3	3
38	f, b	f, b	1	d-e	3	3

TABLE IV (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence	Item Re- sponses By Principal	Case Study Principal Correspondence	Teacher Principal Correspondence
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
39	i	i, a, e	1	b, e	3	3
40	b-f	b-f	1	e-f, g	2	2
41	e-i	i, f, e	2	i, d	2	1
42	f	f, d	1	d-e, a-c	3	3
43	f-g, h-i	j, k, g	3	e-f-g	1	3
44	b-e, a	e, c, b	2	e, h	2	1
45	k, e	k, e	1	e-k	1	1
46	i	i, f, e	1	i, c, b-j	1	1
47	a-d, k	a, j, d	2	a-d-k	1	2
48	b, a	b, d	1	b, f-h	1	1
49	a, d-e-h	a, d-e	1	d, e	3	3
50	f	f, b-g	1	f, g-h	1	1
51	f, a	f, e, a	1	f, b	1	1

TABLE IV (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
52	b, a	b, a	1	b, a	1	1
53	b-g	a, k, d	3	b-g-i	1	3
54	b-g, i	b, g	1	b-g-h	1	1
55	a, b-c	a, b	1	a-b-c	1	1
56	d, b	d, b, f	1	c, d-f	3	3
57	c	c, a-f	1	c	1	1
58	b, c	b, e	1	b-c-g	1	2
59	i, e	i, e	1	b, e-h-i	3	3
60	g, e-e	g, c, b	1	e-g, e-d	1	2
61	h, d	d, h	3	b-h, a-d	1	3
62	e-i, d-j	c, a-i	3	h-i, d-j	2	3
63	f-g	g, f, a	1	e-g, a-f	2	2
64	g	g	1	g, b, a	1	1

TABLE IV (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence	Item Re- sponses By Principal	Case Study Principal Correspondence	Teacher Principal Correspondence
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
65	d-e	d-e	1	e, d-f	1	1
66	a-i, c	i, a	1	a-i, c-h	1	1
67	j, e-g-h	g-j, c-d	2	h-j	1	2
68	f-i	i, a, f-g	2	f-i, a-b-g	1	2
69	c, a	c, a	1	e, e-m	1	1
70	b, h	b, h	1	h	3	1
71	g-j	g, j	1	g, c-f	2	1
72		b, d, e	X	a	X	3
73	i-j, c	j, i, g-h	1	d, a	3	3
74	i	i, j	1	i	1	1
75	c	c	1	c-f	1	1
76	j-l, g	g-j, l	2	l, a-e-g	2	3
77	d-e	d, e	1	b-f-h	3	3

TABLE IV (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
78	b-c	b, e, d	2	a-c-i	2	3
79	h, j	h	1	h-j	1	1
80	h, d	h, b	1	d-e, h	3	3
81	e	e, c	1	e	1	1
82	n, c, m	n, c	1	e-a	2	2
83	a, c-f	a, f, h	1	e, f-h	3	3
84	c, e-j	j	3	c, e-j	1	3
85	e-f, a	a, f	3	c-e-g	2	3
86	f, d	f, d	1	f, d	1	1
Totals			1 = 59 2 = 13 3 = 10 **X = 4		1 = 49 2 = 17 3 = 16 **X = 4	1 = 41 2 = 15 3 = 30
Average Correspondence = 1.402					= 1.598	
Correspondence Per Cent = 79.9					= 70.1	

*Correspondence based on first behavior responses.

**Refers to lack of correspondence due to insufficient case study evidence.

2. Analysis of Results

A percentage result gives rise to a fact and question. The fact is that perfection implies one hundred per cent; the question requires an accounting for the disparity between the given result and perfection. This disparity, in terms of principal responses to Form C, may be attributed to such factors as:

- a. idealizing of behavior; or a response in terms of how the principal prefers to view himself.
- b. behavioral change during the period of study whereby the principal responds in terms of one true behavior; the case study evidence reveals another true behavior.
- c. misunderstanding of a question or one or more of the response items. (This includes the possibility that some ambiguity exists in the instrument or the mind of the respondent.)

In terms of analyzing the responses, misunderstandings (or other extraneous factors) cannot be discerned accurately. (This problem, however, was faced and flaws were corrected after administering the instrument to the twenty-eight principals as discussed [Chapter III].) The evidence provided in the research files does provide sufficient evidence upon which an accounting of other disparities may be attempted. Two examples follow.

Whereas Principal A considered his actions in dealing with personal opposition from the community as characterized by an adjustment in his behavior so as to please all, thereby preventing opposition, he reported his behavior as he wished it observed (see Table I, Question 41, Columns 4, 5). Observations and interviews reveal that considerable opposition, emanating from parents and fostered by a supervisor, has resulted in his securing faculty support and, either explaining his views to these parents, or ignoring them (see Column 1).

Principal C had not dismissed any teachers in recent years, and case study evidence supported this as the principal's most typical behavior (see Table V, Question 77, Column 2). The principal did not consider his recent behavior in this regard as most significant and responded in terms of his actions at a previous time (see Columns 4, 5).

A similar lack of correspondence occurred when Principal B viewed his behavior in securing faculty evaluations as one of inviting such leadership from college consultants (see Table IV, Question 83, Columns 4, 5). However, the research files revealed that, while the principal did not report an inaccuracy, his most recent behavior had been to refer continually to school goals and philosophies in faculty meetings (see Column 2).

At the beginning of the school year, the faculty in School B undertook, as its yearly project, the improvement of school-community

TABLE V

RELATED RESPONSES USED TO TEST INSTRUMENT FOR VALIDITY IN SCHOOL "C"*

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence	Item Re- sponses By Principal	Case Study Principal Correspondence	Teacher Principal Correspondence
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	a-f, g	a-f, l	1	e, a-k-l	3	3
2	h, c-g	h, c-g	1	h, c-g	1	1
3	d, e-f	b, d	3	d-e, f-h	1	3
4	c-g	b, f-g	3	e, a, g	3	3
5	a-d, b	i, k, a	3	a, b-d	1	3
6	c, e-f	e-f, e	1	c, e-f	1	1
7	i, j, d	i-j	1	i, d-e-j	1	1
8	a-d-h	h, a	1	a-d-h	1	1
9		c-d	x	d, c	x	1
10	j-o, m	j, l-m	2	j, n	2	1
11	d, o	d, f	1	d-f, g	2	1
12	e-h, b-j	h	2	b, a	3	3

TABLE V (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
13	b, d-e	b, a, e	1	d, a-b	3	3
14	a-b, c-f	f, i, b	3	a, f, b	2	3
15	a-c, h	a, c, h	1	c, a	1	3
16	b, d-e	c, d	3	a, b, e	3	3
17		e-g	X	e, h, g	X	2
18	a, b	a	1	a, b	1	1
19	g, j-l	g, b	1	a, b-g	3	3
20	a	a	1	b	3	3
21	e-h	h, e	1	g, h, e	3	3
22	k, h	k, h	1	f, j-k	3	3
23	a-b	a	1	b-d, c-f	2	3
24	e, f-g	e, f	1	e, f, g	1	1
25	d-f	d, f, a	1	d, f	1	1

TABLE V (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence	Item Re- sponses By Principal	Case Study Principal Correspondence	Teacher Principal Correspondence
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
26	d, c-g	d, c	1	g, f, d	3	3
27	b, c, d	b, c	1	b, c, e	1	1
28	d	d	1	d, g	1	1
29	i, j	i-j	1	c-i, j	2	2
30	c-e	e, c	1	e, f, g	2	1
31	d-g	a, f, b	3	d, c, b	2	3
32	c, e	c, b, e	1	c, b	1	1
33	c, j, l	c, h	1	c, j, m	1	1
34	d-e, f	d, e	1	f, e, d	3	3
35	e, g	e, g	1	e, g, d	1	1
36	e, d	e, d	1	e, d	1	1
37	a-c	a, e	2	a, e, d	2	1
38	g	c-g	1	e, g, c	3	3

TABLE V (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
39	e, i	e, i	1	e, b, j	1	1
40	e, f	e	1	e, c, f	1	1
41	k	k	1	k, g, i	1	1
42	d, a	b-d, e	2	d, e, a	1	2
43	e, b, f	f, e-d	3	f, d, e	3	1
44	h, e-f	e, h, f	3	h, b, e	1	3
45	c	c, d	1	e, d, k	1	1
46	f-i, e-g	i, f	1	h-i	2	2
47	a-d, h	e-d	1	a, d, h-j	1	1
48	h-j	h	1	j, f, h	2	3
49	a, d-e	a, d	1	g, e, d	3	3
50	d-f, h	f, h, e	2	d, e-h	2	3
51	b-f, c	f, d	2	d, c-e	3	3

TABLE V (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
(1)	(2)	(3)				
52	c-d, a	d, c, a	1	d, a, c	2	1
53	e, o, g	e, c, f	1	b-e, f-g	3	3
54	b, g-h-i	b, g, h	1	b, c, g-i	1	1
55	f, a-b	f, b, a	1	f, a-c	1	1
56		d, f, b	X	h, d-f	X	3
57	a-c	c, e	2	a, c, f	1	3
58	e-f	e, f, c	1	f, b	2	3
59	e, i	i, e, h	2	e, g, h	1	3
60	c, a-g	c, g, e	1	c, a-d-e-f	1	1
61	a, d	a, d, f	1	e, d, e	1	1
62	i-j, c-k	i, c, g	2	i-j, k	1	2
63	f-g	f-g	1	b-h, a-g	3	3
64	b-c, a-g	b-g	2	c, b, g	1	3

TABLE V (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
65	e, d, b	e, d	1	e, f, a	1	1
66	a-i	a, i	1	c, a-d	3	3
67	e-j	e, i, j	2	j, b-f	2	3
68	f, i	f	1	f, b-g	2	1
69	g, c	g, c	1	m, d, h-j	3	3
70		h, a, c	x	c-d, e	x	3
71	f, g	f, e, g	1	f, i, e	1	1
72		e	x	e, d	x	1
73	j	j, a, b	1	j, d-e	1	1
74	i	i, j	1	i	1	1
75	e, d-f	e, d	1	e, f, d-h	1	1
76	d-j	k, d-l	3	l, k, j	3	3
77	i-e	i, e	1	e, f	3	3

TABLE V (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
(1)	(2)	(3)				
78	b	b	1	b-e, g	1	1
79	e, c	e, c, a	1	e, c	1	1
80	i, b, h	i, l, b	1	g, h-b	3	3
81	a, c-d	a-c	1	a-d	1	2
82	n, m	n, m	1	m-n, c-g	1	1
83	a	a, b-e	1	f, e, b	3	3
84	f, j	f, j	1	f, h-j	1	1
85	a	a	1	a, g, f	1	1
86	f	f, d-e	1	f	1	1
	Totals		1 = 61 2 = 11 3 = 9 **X = 5		1 = 43 2 = 15 3 = 23 X = 5	1 = 42 2 = 6 3 = 38
			Average Correspondence = 1.358 Correspondence Per Cent = 82.1		= 1.753 = 62.4	= 1.953 = 52.4

*Correspondence based on first behavior responses.

**Refers to lack of correspondence due to insufficient case study evidence.

relations. Related to this goal was a desire to include parents in helping with curriculum change. Such growth has been commonly recognized as slow. However, the principal viewed the progress, in leading toward this growth, out of proportion to the reality existing in the situation. His behavior toward gaining lay participation in the program was changing, but did not warrant his responding as he did (see Table IV, Question 49, Columns 2, 4, 5).

D. Case Study-Teacher Correspondence

1. The Use of Selected Teachers.

The literature in the field of tests and measurements presents general agreement in the caution, "Valid for what?" If a test is to be valid for an explicit purpose, safeguards must be taken to assure not only that the instrument measures what it purposes to measure, but that it be administered under similar conditions at all times. Therefore, during the design phases of the research, it was agreed to administer and test the instrument with a principal with whom no rapport had been established by those connected with the research project. (This would represent a test in a typical situation.)

This step posed the problem of securing external criteria by which the instrument could be tested with a fifth principal. The methods employed in the intensive study of the four schools were too laborious and time consuming to utilize. Therefore, an hypothesis was forwarded

that selected teachers in a school were capable of providing the data necessary for cross-checking. To test the hypothesis it was decided to administer the final instrument to five teachers in each of the schools where principals were to respond to the same instrument.

The number and selection of teachers to whom the instrument was administered were arbitrarily arrived at. Because of various factors (e. g. the nature of the job, the teacher's interests) some teachers in a school tended to know little about a principal's way of working with community members; others were not familiar with his behavior in planning with students; etc. The object, in utilizing this method of studying principal behavior, was to discover those best qualified to know the specific behaviors of the school principal as exhibited in the situations presented in Form C, (see Appendix C). The investigator, because of the year's intensive study, was able to identify those teachers who were most familiar with the principal's ways of working.

In the four schools studied intensively, the principal was asked to name the five teachers who could satisfy the two conditions of being in the best position to know principal behavior and of being objective enough to record their perceptions in line with their knowledge. With three of the principals, the researcher had already listed those teachers he intended to select. One principal selected the same five; the second selected four of the five (and the fifth was one the researcher might have chosen as easily as any of the others selected.) The third

principal preferred to name eight teachers. Four of the five selected by the researcher were included among the eight. The researcher raised the question of using the one omitted by the principal and he agreed that this teacher would have been acceptable, as well.

In the fourth school, the principal was requested to select five teachers prior to any commitment by the researcher. After having done so, the principal's selections were presented to two other researchers and to the director of the project. There was agreement that the teachers he selected were similar to those the research team would have selected.

There is a lack of sufficient sampling evidence to enable the writer to make an unqualified assertion that principals are able to select the teachers who know their principal's behavior best and who possess sufficient objectivity to relate accurately their knowledge of the principal's ways of working. However, within the limitations of the sampling utilized in this study, the evidence reveals that principals are capable of selecting the teachers to meet the criteria discussed above.

2. Interpretation of the Tables

Teacher responses to the instrument were tabulated in a manner similar to that used with the twenty-eight principals (see Chapter III). Three points were allotted to a first priority, two to a second choice, and one to a third choice. Where two or more behaviors were

TABLE VI

RELATED RESPONSES USED TO TEST INSTRUMENT FOR VALIDITY IN SCHOOL "D"

203

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
1	e-l, f	l, e-f	1	e, f, l	2	3
2	e-g, h	c, g-h	1	c, g	1	1
3	b, a	b, e-h	1	b, a-c	1	1
4	b, f	b, f, g	1	b-f, e	1	1
5	d-f	f, d, l	1	f	1	1
6	b-g	c, d, f-g	3	c-d, f	3	1
7	a-l	i-j	2	i, j	2	1
8	f, a	f, a	1	d, f-j	3	3
9		c	x	e	x	1
10	h, j-o	h-j-l	1	h, b-j-o	1	1
11	d, f	d, f	1	c-d, e-f	2	2
12	a-e, j	a	1	d, e	3	3

TABLE VI (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence	Item Re- sponses By Principal	Case Study Principal Correspondence	Teacher Principal Correspondence
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
13	a-b, c	b, a, c, d	1	a-b, c	1	1
14	b-e, c-f	b, e, c-f	1	a-b	2	2
15	a, b-c	a, c, b	1	c, a-b	3	3
16	b-d, c, e	d, b	1	b-d-e	1	1
17	b, c-g	h, g, c	1	h, c-f-g	1	1
18	a-c	c, a	1	a	1	3
19	g-j	g, j	1	b-g-j	1	1
20	a	a, b	1	a	1	1
21	g	g	1	g	1	1
22	k, h	k, h	1	k	1	1
23		b, a-f	X	b, f, c-e	X	1
24	e-f	e-f	1	e-f-g	1	1
25	b-d-f	d	1	d, f	2	1

TABLE VI (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses From Case Study (2)	Item Responses By Teachers (3)	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
26		d, a	X	g, d	X	3
27		b, c, d	X	b-c	X	1
28	d	d	1	d	1	1
29		i	X	c-d, b-j	X	3
30	g	g	1	g, h	1	1
31	f, m	f, a-m	1	f-m	1	1
32	c-e	c	1	b	3	3
33	h-l, f	h, l	1	h, i-l	1	1
34	i, c	i, f	1	d, a	3	3
35	e	e, g	1	e, g	1	1
36	d, c	d, c	1	d-e	2	2
37	c, e	c, e	1	a-o, d	3	3
38	h	e, g, c	3	e, c-g	3	1

TABLE VI (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence	Item Re- sponses By Principal	Case Study Principal Correspondence	Teacher Principal Correspondence
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
39	i, b	e, i, a	3	e-i, f-j	2	1
40	e, f, b-e	e, b-f	1	b-f, c	3	3
41	b-f, d-e	f, b	1	b-d	2	3
42	b, a	b	1	b, c	1	1
43	c, f-g	c, g, f	1	b-c-g	1	1
44	e, f-h	e, h	1	b-e, f-h	2	2
45	k	k, d	1	k, g	1	1
46	i, e	i, e	1	i, f	1	1
47	a, h, j	a, d	1	a	1	1
48	d, a	d	1	d, b-c	1	1
49	a, b-e	a	1	a	1	1
50	a, f	f, a, g	3	e, a-b-e	3	3
51	f, a	f	1	c-f, b	2	1

TABLE VI (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence (4)	Item Re- sponses By Principal (5)	Case Study Principal Correspondence (6)	Teacher Principal Correspondence (7)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
52	b, a	a	3	a, d	3	1
53	e, a, j-k	e, a-k	1	k	3	3
54	b, g, i	b, g, i	1	b	1	1
55	b, a-d	b, d, a	1	b-d, a-f	1	1
56	d, e-f-g	d, g, f, e	1	d-e-f	1	2
57	e, b-g	e, b-g	1	e, a-b-g	1	1
58	f, e	f	1	f	1	1
59	e-i	e-i	1	e-i	1	1
60	c-e-g	c	1	c-e-g	1	1
61	d, a	d, a	1	a-d	1	1
62	a-i, f-j	a-i	1	a-e-i	1	1
63	a-f-g	g, a, f	1	a-f-g	1	1
64	g, b-c	g, b-d	1	g	1	1

TABLE VI (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence	Item Re- sponses By Principal	Case Study Principal Correspondence	Teacher Principal Correspondence
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
65	d	d-e, f	1	f	3	3
66	a-i, c	a, i	1	a-i, b-h	1	1
67	e	e, h	1	e-j, h	1	2
68	h	a, e	3	e-g, f-i	3	33
69	a-f, c-d	a-f	1	a-f, d	1	1
70	g, e-h	g, h	1	g, e-h	1	1
71	e-i, f-j	e-i, f	1	e-i, c-f	1	1
72		e, i, b	x	e-i, d	x	1
73	b, a, f	b, f-i	1	b-g-h	1	2
74	i	i, j	1	i	1	1
75	e, c	e, c	1	c-e-f	1	1
76	g	g, l	1	g, l-k	1	1
77	e, d-f	b	3	b-c	3	1

TABLE VI (Continued)

Question	Item Responses From Case Study	Item Responses By Teachers	Case Study Teacher Correspondence	Item Re- sponses By Principal	Case Study Principal Correspondence	Teacher Principal Correspondence
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
78	j	j, f	1	j	1	1
79	d, h	d, h	1	d	1	1
80	b-h	h	1	b-h	1	1
81	c, e	c, e	1	c	1	1
82	b-c-n	b, c, n	1	b-c-n	1	1
83	a-d, g	a, f, b	2	a-g, e	2	3
84	e-j, f	j, f	2	e	1	3
85						
86						
Totals			1 = 68 2 = 3 3 = 7 **X = 6		1 = 53 2 = 11 3 = 14 X = 6	1 = 59 2 = 7 3 = 18
Average Correspondence			= 1.218		= 1.512	
Correspondence Per Cent			= 89.1		= 75.0	

*Correspondence based on first behavior responses.

**Refers to lack of correspondence due to insufficient case study evidence.

selected as having equal priority, the points allotted were shared equally. For example, if a teacher believed that his principal determined the functions of committees by leading the committees, on some occasions, and having committees determine their own functions, on other occasions, each item was allotted two and one-half points (see Form C, Question 25, Items c and f).

Four master copies of the instrument were used for recording the responses, one for each group of selected teachers in a school. After each group of responses were recorded and summed, the results were placed directly in Tables III-VI. The tabulations were made after the investigator's predictions were recorded.

In presenting the data in the tables, it was believed that importance should be assigned to the distributions of responses within each behavior grouping. Therefore, when the response total from the teachers in any school to a given question was inclined toward a single behavior, other behaviors were not represented in the tables. For example, the response totals from the teachers in School A to the principal's procedure in handling pupil-teacher conferences that dealt with a discipline problem (see Form C, Question 15) revealed five behaviors. The totals signified that, to a high degree (13 points), the principal usually conferred with the parent and pupil and then decided on the best solution himself. Of the other four behaviors responded to, none received more than a total of three points. In such instances, only the highest priority was

recognized (see Table III, Question 15). Whenever response total revealed distributions that did not isolate one or more behaviors (e.g. 8, 6, 4 1/2, and 4 points totals for four behaviors in a single grouping), all were recorded (see Table IV, Question 6). Were the tables to present two or more behaviors, regardless of the spread of distributions, the conclusions would have been misleading.

The distributions of responses by teachers were assigned importance in another manner. If two of the behaviors receiving high priority in any given situation were within a single point of one another, they were presented in the tables as having received equal priority. If for example, the totals for two behaviors were nine and eight and one-half points, it would have been questionable to assume that the five teachers, as a group, meant to assert that one behavior's priority was established over the other's. (The case studies and their representation in the tables revealed numerous instances where two behaviors were employed equally. However, the investigator was unable and unwilling to assume that they were employed by the principal a precisely equal number of times.)

3. Analysis of Results

Teachers, being less personally involved in responding to the check list than their principals, were tested to see if they would respond objectively to the instrument. By the very nature of their tasks,

however, they could not be as familiar with their status leader's functions as he was. A teacher may have been in an excellent position to observe a principal in some situations -- a poor position to observe him in others. In selecting five teachers to respond to the instrument, it was necessary to be aware of the limitations, as well as the advantages. Disparities may be attributed to such factors as:

- a. being too far removed from some of the principal's behaviors
- b. subjectivity; or a response pattern determined by a temporary or constant attitude toward the principal, or the task of responding to an instrument at a time when much paper work had accrued
- c. behavioral change during the period of study
- d. misunderstanding of a question or response items

Especially as regards the second factor, teachers were prone to making such comments as: "He's a good principal and I wouldn't wish to hurt him in any way."; "If I could have filled this out when I wasn't so busy, I might have done a better job." There is no way of determining the extent to which a more perfect correspondence might have been achieved, had it been possible to administer the instrument earlier in the school year.

The five teachers in School C, who responded to the instrument, believed that the principal was direct in treating pupil suggestions (see

Table V, Question 3, Columns 3, 4). This behavior, while not uncommon, was not most typical. Students in the school were aware of the fact that Principal C usually referred them to the student council (Column 2). Actually, two of the five teachers did signify the most typical behavior; but three did not.

Teachers in School D achieved the highest validity percentage in the four schools (see Table VI and VII). However, where disparity in correspondence did exist, it appeared to result from a desire to see the principal as the "best" principal. This reaction was continually recorded in the research files.

An example of the nature of this type of disparity may be gleaned from teacher responses to the situation dealing with Principal D's behavior in reacting to individual teacher opposition (see Table VI, Question 38, Columns 2, 3, 4). Whereas case study evidence revealed that he was sensitive to and reacted in terms of the faculty's expectations, the selected teachers believed that their principal encouraged individual criticisms from them.

Behavioral change appears to account for the lack of correspondence in School A concerning the use of community members in faculty meetings (see Table III, Question 52, Columns 2, 3, 4). Whereas, in pre-planning meetings, prior to the beginning of the school year, parents were invited to participate, the result had little positive effect. The principal tended to withdraw from parent planning, he did not invite

them to future faculty meetings, and voiced sentiments that little value resulted from past inclusion of parent thinking in matters of school concern. Teacher responses, while not entirely inaccurate, did not correspond to current principal behavior.

E. Teacher-Principal Correspondence and Composite Correspondence

1. Interrelationship of Teacher-Principal Correspondences in the Four Schools.

The attempt to arrive at a percentage of correspondence between teacher responses and those of the principal (see Table III-VI) was motivated by the following questions:

- a. To what extent does a select group of teachers agree with the principal on perceptions of the principal's behavior?
- b. How do teacher-principal correspondence per cents in the four schools participating in the intensive study compare with a similar correspondence per cent in a non-rapport school? (see Table VIII).

Table VII presents a composite of correspondence per cents of testing the instrument for validity in the four schools. It may be noted that teacher-principal agreement was highest in School D -- lowest in School A. However, School A did not differ from Schools B and C to as marked a degree as any of them did from School D. The research files bear evidence that provides a possible accounting for the discrepancy. In no other school were teachers as loyal in support of a

TABLE VII

COMPOSITE OF CORRESPONDENCE PERCENTAGES IN THE SCHOOLS

Type Correspondence ^a	School				Weighted Mean Validity ^b
	A	B	C	D	
Case Study-Teacher	89.1	79.9	82.1	89.1	85.0
Case Study-Principal	68.0	70.1	62.4	75.0	69.4
Teacher-Principal	56.4	56.4	52.4	74.4	59.8
Mean Validity ^c	78.6	75.0	72.2	82.0	77.2 ^c

^aAll correspondence percentages derived from Tables III-VI.

^bBased on accumulated number of correspondences from Tables III-VI.
(The greatest divergence of any single mean validity, as derived from this table, is 00.5 and is 00.2 for the Average Mean Validity).

^cDoes not include Teacher-Principal Correspondence.

principal as was the case in School D. Rapport between investigators and the school staff was most difficult to achieve here due to this fact. Researchers were agreed that the teachers were "defending their principal" in the early stages of the intensive study.

Of greater significance is the fact that the weighted mean validity for teacher-principal correspondence was markedly lower than the other correspondences. With the exception of School D, all teacher-principal correspondences were lower than either of the other types of correspondences.

On the basis of the limited evidence from the sampling used, it appears that there is a lower correspondence between the judgments of those teachers in the best position to know their principal's ways of working and the judgments of the principals themselves, than there is between the principal's judgments and the case-study evidence, or than there is between teachers' judgments and case-study evidence.

Table VII also reveals that for all the schools, as well as for any one school, the agreement of teacher perceptions with case study evidence is more apparent than is case study evidence and the principal's perceptions. This finding reveals that, within the limitations of this study, a select group of teachers are better able to describe the reality of the principal's ways of working than he is.

2. Teacher-Principal Correspondence in the Non-Rapport School.

The data in Table VIII was secured from a school that was not previously studied by the research team. The principal of the school was one of twenty-eight who had responded to the instrument for the purpose of testing the extent to which principals distinguished among the behaviors (see Chapter III). His school was chosen at random and he selected five teachers to respond to the instrument -- the procedure being consistent with that used in Schools A-D. The variable that differentiated this school from Schools A-D was one of rapport. The investigator had established relationships with the staffs of Schools A-D prior to administering the final instrument to their respective principals and selected teachers. However, no rapport had been established with the staff in the school revealing the data contained in Table VIII.

The trends appearing in Table VII lend significance to the data in Table VIII. These trends are:

- a. The greater the teacher-principal correspondence in a school, the greater the case study-teacher correspondence.
- b. The greater the teacher-principal correspondence in a school, the greater the case study-principal correspondence.
- c. The greater the teacher-principal correspondence in a school, the greater the mean validity. (This must follow as a result of the two preceding trends.)

In the non-rapport school (see Table VIII), the per cent of 56.6

TABLE VIII

RELATED RESPONSES USED TO TEST FOR VALIDITY IN NON-RAPPORT SCHOOL*

218

Question (1)	Item Responses By Teachers (2)	Item Responses By Principal (3)	Teacher-Principal Correspondence (4)
1	a, l	k, l	3
2	c, h, g	c, g, f	1
3	b, e, a	h	3
4	b, h, f	b, f, g	1
5	b, h, f	b, f, g	1
6	f, b	d, e	3
7	a-b, i	j	3
8	a-d-e	d, a, e	1
9	a-c, d	c, a, d	1
10	d, b-f	h, g, d	3
11	d, f, e	d, f	1
12	c-e, f	b-e, a	2

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses By Teachers (2)	Item Responses By Principal (3)	Teacher-Principal Correspondence (4)
13	a-c, d-e	a, e, c	2
14	b-c, f	e, b, f	3
15	a, h, b	a, c, b	1
16	c, d	c, b, a	1
17	e, f-g-h	e, g	1
18	a, i	a, k, i	1
19	b, g, e	b, g, d	1
20	a	c	3
21	g, h, c	g, c, e	1
22	g, h-k	d-g, k	2
23	a, b, e	d, b, f	3
24	e, a	e, a	1
25	b, a	a, e, c	3

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses By Teachers (2)	Item Responses By Principal (3)	Teacher-Principal Correspondence (4)
26	c, d, a	a, b, d	3
27	d, b, a	b-c, a	3
28	d, e, b	d, f, c	1
29	j, h, c	i, e, j	3
30	g, e	g, f	1
31	f-g	a, k, b	3
32	c, d, g	e, g, b	1
33	h, l	h, l	1
34	a-g, d	e, d, h	3
35	e, d, g	e, g	1
36	d, e	f, d, e	3
37	e, a	d-e	2
38	g, c, d	g, e, a	1

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses By Teachers (2)	Item Responses By Principal (3)	Teacher-Principal Correspondence (4)
39	c	e, i, b	3
40	e, f, c	b, c	3
41	i, k, f	b, f	3
42	d, e, i	c-d, h-j	2
43	f, d, g	f, g, e	1
44	b, d, h	b, e, f	1
45	f-k	d-f, h	2
46	i, f	i, e, j	1
47	a, h, j	a, d, g	1
48	d	e, h, b	3
49	a	c, e, b	3
50	e, f, h	f, g, c	1
51	d-f, b	d, f, c	1

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses By Teachers (2)	Item Responses By Principal (3)	Teacher-Principal Correspondence (4)
52	b	a, c	3
53	a-k-e	e, a, k	1
54	b, i	b, c, i	1
55	d, b, a	d, b, a	1
56	d-f, e	d, f, e	1
57	d, a, g	c, f, g	3
58	f	e, b, g	3
59	e, i, h-j	e, h, b	1
60	f, c-d-g	c-e-f	1
61	a	a, c	1
62	c, a-f	a-h-i	3
63	g, f	e, f, a	3
64	b, e	b, e	1

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses By Teachers (2)	Item Responses By Principal (3)	Teacher-Principal Correspondence (4)
65	d-e, a	e, a-d	1
66	a-c-e	d, c	3
67	f, j	f-i-j	1
68	a-e, b	a, e-i	1
69	l, c-d	d, c-h	3
70	a-c-h	c-h, a-d	1
71	e, i, c	e, f, i	1
72	e, d, b	e, d	1
73	b, a, f	f, a-h	3
74	i	j	3
75	e, j, g	e-f, c	2
76	l, b-k	l, i, k	1
77	b, e, f	b, e	1

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Question (1)	Item Responses By Teachers (2)	Item Responses By Principal (3)	Teacher-Principal Correspondence (4)
78	b, c	b	1
79	j	j	1
80	d-a, b-h	b-h, d	3
81	c	a-c	1
82	d, m	b-n, c	3
83	a, e	a, h, e	1
84	f, i	f, b, e	1
85			
86			
Totals			1 = 14 2 = 7 3 = 33 = 1.869 = 56.6
Average Correspondence Correspondence Per Cent			

*Correspondence based on first behavior responses.

for teacher-principal correspondence lays between the 56.6 per cent for Schools A and B and the 74.4 per cent for School D. Another manner in which we may view the relative position that the non-rapport school occupies as a result of the trends in Table VII, is to note that the 56.6 per cent figure lies 3.2 per cent below the weighted mean validity of 59.8 for Schools A-D.

On the bases of the consistency of the trends in the limited sampling of four schools and the two manners of viewing the relative position of the non-rapport school, as cited above, inferences are provided. They are that the non-rapport school case study-teacher correspondence lies in the neighborhood of 84 per cent and case study-principal correspondence lies in the neighborhood of 69 per cent. These estimates are a result of averaging the two methods of viewing the relative position of the non-rapport school. They reveal unusual proximity to the weighted mean validities.

F. Question Validity and Reducing the Size of the Instrument

The inability to apply standard statistical procedures for correlating the data discussed above also served as a handicap in attempting to reduce the size of the instrument. The lack of scaled or quantified items prevented the application of an item analysis for which criteria with precedence has been established.

The use of responses to the instrument by twenty-eight principals

(see Chapter III) provided a basis for instrument reduction. However, the size of the sample was not deemed large enough to merit the elimination of those questions that revealed the poorest distribution within behavior groupings.

It was decided to explore another area of inspection, viz., question validity. The same types of correspondence established above were tabulated on a question-by-question basis for Schools A-D. (The results appear in Table IX.) The method used to arrive at correspondence per cents was similar to the one employed previously in this chapter. Each type of correspondence (principal responses with case study evidence, teacher responses with case study evidence, and principal responses with teacher responses) was treated with equal weighting. Where case study evidence was insufficient for a prediction, the space provided for the correspondence rating was left open, and no per cent was indicated.

The selection of an arbitrary criterion was made, i. e., any question whose correspondence per cent was below 50 was considered unsatisfactory in the test for its validity. The questions considered poor by this standard were 4, 12, 34, 37, 38 (see Table IX). However, inspection revealed that Questions 25, 49, 53, 60, 77, and 83 possessed correspondence per cents of 50 and these, too, were considered poor.

Because of the small size of the sample, it was decided to compare these findings with those of the distribution within behavior

groupings as revealed by the twenty-eight principals (cf. Tables II and IX). The comparison revealed that only three questions failed to meet the criteria for both sets of findings, viz., Questions 25, 34, and 77. On the whole, a negative relationship was revealed between the two sets of findings.

Due to the fact that another investigator will assume the responsibility of administering the instrument in the ensuing phase of the University of Florida Study, it is the purpose of the writer to set forth these findings and provide an option. That option calls for choices among utilizing the instrument in its present form until further validation procedures reenforced or nullify the current data signifying low correspondence percentages; applying other criteria and deleting questions that fail to meet it; or accepting the instrument in its present form without any attempt to reduce it in size. This investigator questions the use of arbitrary criteria at this time due to the small size of the samples used for the two sets of data compared above.

G. Reliability

Reliability, which measures the congruency of a subject's test performance at different times, can neither be feasibly attained with the instrument at this time, nor is there an adequate basis for the measure.

The literature on test construction deals with three methods of testing this measure of consistency of performance: the split-half, equivalent form, and test-retest techniques.

TABLE IX

CORRESPONDENCE PERCENTAGES FOR FOUR SCHOOLS USED TO TEST INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS FOR VALIDITY

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage *
1	Case Study-Teacher	1	2	1	1	1.25	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	3	2	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	3	2.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.33	2.33	1.67	2.00	66.7
2	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	100.0
3	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Case Study-Principal	1	2	1	1	1.25	
	Teacher-Principal	1	2	3	1	1.75	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.67	2.33	1.00	1.50	75.0
4	Case Study-Teacher	1	2	3	1	1.75	
	Case Study-Principal	3	3	3	1	2.50	
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	3	1	2.50	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	2.67	3.00	1.00	2.25	37.5
5	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	2.33	1.00	1.33	83.3

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	School C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
6	Case Study-Teacher	1	2	1	3	1.75	50.3
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	1	3	2.00	
	Teacher-Principal	3	2	1	1	1.75	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	1.67	1.00	2.33	1.83	
7	Case Study-Teacher	3	2	1	2	2.00	66.7
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	2	1.25	
	Teacher-Principal	3	2	1	1	1.75	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	1.67	1.00	1.67	1.67	
8	Case Study-Teacher	3	1	1	1	1.50	62.5
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	1	3	2.00	
	Teacher-Principal	2	1	1	3	1.75	
	Average Correspondence	2.67	1.00	1.00	2.33	1.75	
9	Case Study-Teacher						X
	Case Study-Principal						
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Average Correspondence						
10	Case Study-Teacher	3	1	2	1	1.75	66.7
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	2	1	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	3	1	1	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	3.00	1.00	1.67	1.00	1.67	
11	Case Study-Teacher	2	1	1	1	1.25	79.2
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	2	2	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	2	1	1	2	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.67	1.00	1.33	1.67	1.42	

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	School C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
12	Case Study-Teacher	1	3	2	1	1.75	
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	3	3	2.50	
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	3	3	3.00	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	2.33	2.67	2.33	2.42	29.1
13	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	2	3	1	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	1	3	3	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	2.00	2.33	1.00	1.58	71.8
14	Case Study-Teacher	2	1	3	1	1.75	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	2	2	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	3	1	3	2	2.25	
	Average Correspondence	2.00	1.00	2.67	1.67	1.83	58.3
15	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	3	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	3	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	1.67	2.33	1.50	75.0
16	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.50	75.0
17	Case Study-Teacher	1			1		
	Case Study-Principal	2			1		
	Teacher-Principal	2	1	2	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.67			1.00		X

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
18	Case Study-Teacher	2	2	1	1	1.50	
	Case Study-Principal	2	2	1	1	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	3	2	1	3	2.25	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	2.00	1.00	1.67	1.75	62.5
19	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	2.33	1.00	1.33	83.3
20	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	2.33	1.00	1.33	83.3
21	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	2.33	1.00	1.33	83.3
22	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	3	1	2.00	
	Teacher-Principal	3	1	3	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	1.00	2.33	1.00	1.67	66.7
23	Case Study-Teacher	1		1			
	Case Study-Principal	3		2			
	Teacher-Principal	3	2	3	1	2.25	
	Average Correspondence	2.33		2.00			X

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	School C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
24	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	3	2	1	1	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	3	1	1	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.42	79.2
25	Case Study-Teacher	2	3	1	1	1.75	
	Case Study-Principal	3	3	1	2	2.25	
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	1	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	2.67	3.00	1.00	1.33	2.00	50.0
26	Case Study-Teacher		1	1			
	Case Study-Principal		1	3			
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	3	3	3.00	
	Average Correspondence		1.67	2.33			X
27	Case Study-Teacher		1	1			
	Case Study-Principal		1	1			
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Average Correspondence		1.00	1.00			X
28	Case Study-Teacher		1	1			
	Case Study-Principal		1	1	1		
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Average Correspondence		1.00	1.00	1.00		X
29	Case Study-Teacher		1	1			
	Case Study-Principal		1	2			
	Teacher-Principal	3	1	2	3	2.25	
	Average Correspondence		1.00	1.67			X

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	School C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
30	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	66.7
	Case Study-Principal	2	3	2	1	2.00	
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	1	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	2.00	2.33	1.33	1.00	1.67	
31	Case Study-Teacher	1	3	1	1	2.00	50.3
	Case Study-Principal	1	2	1	1	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	1	3	1	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	2.67	1.00	1.00	1.83	
32	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	62.5
	Case Study-Principal	2	3	1	3	2.25	
	Teacher-Principal	1	3	1	3	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.33	2.33	1.00	2.33	1.75	
33	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	67.5
	Case Study-Principal	2	1	1	1	1.25	
	Teacher-Principal	3	1	1	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.25	
34	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	45.8
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	3	3	2.50	
	Teacher-Principal	3	2	3	3	2.75	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	1.33	2.33	2.33	2.08	
35	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	95.8
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.25	
	Average Correspondence	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.08	

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
36	Case Study-Teacher	1	2	1	1	1.25	
	Case Study-Principal	3	2	1	2	2.00	
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	1	2	2.25	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	2.33	1.00	1.67	1.83	58.3
37	Case Study-Teacher	1	3	2	1	1.75	
	Case Study-Principal	1	3	2	3	2.25	
	Teacher-Principal	2	3	1	3	2.25	
	Average Correspondence	1.33	3.00	1.67	2.33	2.08	45.8
38	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	3	1.50	
	Case Study-Principal	1	3	3	3	2.50	
	Teacher-Principal	2	3	3	1	2.25	
	Average Correspondence	1.33	2.33	2.33	2.33	2.08	45.3
39	Case Study-Teacher		1	1	3		
	Case Study-Principal		3	1	2		
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	1	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence		2.33	1.00	2.00		X
40	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	2	1	2	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	1	2	1	3	1.75	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.67	1.00	2.00	1.42	79.2
41	Case Study-Teacher	1	2	1	1	1.25	
	Case Study-Principal	3	2	1	2	2.00	
	Teacher-Principal	3	1	1	3	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	1.67	1.00	2.00	1.75	62.5

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	1	2	School	3	4	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
42	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	2	1	1.25	
	Case Study-Principal	2	3	3	1	1	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	3	2	1	2.25	
	Average Correspondence	2.00	2.33	1.67	1.00		1.75	62.5
43	Case Study-Teacher	1	3	3	3	1	2.00	
	Case Study-Principal	2	1	3	3	1	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	1	1	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	2.00	2.33	2.33	1.00		1.92	54.1
44	Case Study-Teacher		2	3	3	1		
	Case Study-Principal		2	1	2			
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	2		1.75	x
	Average Correspondence		1.67	2.33	1.67			
45	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	2	1	1	1	1	1.25	
	Average Correspondence	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.08	95.8
46	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	2	1	1	1.25	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	2	2	1	1.25	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	1.67	1.00		1.17	91.7
47	Case Study-Teacher	1	2	1	1	1	1.25	
	Case Study-Principal	2	1	1	1	1	1.25	
	Teacher-Principal	2	2	1	1	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.67	1.67	1.00	1.00		1.33	83.3

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
48	Case Study-Teacher	3	1	1	1	1.50	
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	2	1	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	3	1	3	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.75	62.5
49	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	3	3	3	1	2.50	
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	3	1	2.50	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	2.33	2.33	1.00	2.00	50.0
50	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	2	3	1.75	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	2	3	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	3	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	2.33	3.00	1.83	58.3
51	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	2	1	1.25	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	3	2	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	2.67	1.33	1.50	75.0
52	Case Study-Teacher	3	1	1	3	2.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	2	3	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.67	1.00	1.33	2.33	1.58	71.8
53	Case Study-Teacher	1	3	1	1	1.50	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	3	3	2.00	
	Teacher-Principal	1	3	3	3	2.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	2.33	2.33	2.33	2.00	50.0

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	School C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
54	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	100.0
55	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	100.0
56	Case Study-Teacher	1	1		1		
	Case Study-Principal	1	3		1		
	Teacher-Principal	1	3	3	2	2.25	X
	Average Correspondence	1.00	2.33		1.33		
57	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	2	1	1.25	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	3	1	3	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.67	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.42	79.2
58	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	2	1	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	3	2	3	1	2.25	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	1.33	2.00	1.00	1.67	66.7
59	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	2	1	1.25	
	Case Study-Principal	1	3	1	1	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	1	3	3	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	2.33	2.00	1.00	1.58	71.8

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
60	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	1	2	1	1	1.25	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.08	95.6
61	Case Study-Teacher	1	3	1	1	1.50	
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	1	1	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	1	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	2.33	1.00	1.00	1.67	66.7
62	Case Study-Teacher	2	3	2	1	2.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	2	1	1	1.25	
	Teacher-Principal	2	3	2	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.67	2.67	1.67	1.00	1.75	62.5
63	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	2	3	1	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	1	2	3	1	1.75	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.67	2.33	1.00	1.50	75.0
64	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	2	1	1.25	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	2	1	3	1	1.75	
	Average Correspondence	1.33	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.33	83.3
65	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	3	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	2	1	1	3	1.75	
	Average Correspondence	1.33	1.00	1.00	2.33	1.42	79.2

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
65	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	2	1	3	1	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	2	1	3	1	1.75	
	Average Correspondence	1.67	1.00	2.33	1.00	1.50	75.0
67	Case Study-Teacher	2	2	2	1	1.75	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	2	1	1.25	
	Teacher-Principal	2	2	3	2	2.25	
	Average Correspondence	1.67	1.67	2.33	1.33	1.75	62.5
68	Case Study-Teacher	1	2	1	3	1.75	
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	2	3	2.25	
	Teacher-Principal	2	2	1	3	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	2.00	1.67	1.33	3.00	2.00	50.0
69	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	3	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	2.33	1.00	1.33	83.3
70	Case Study-Teacher	2	1		1		
	Case Study-Principal	1	3		1		
	Teacher-Principal	2	1	3	1	1.75	X
	Average Correspondence	1.67	1.67		1.00		
71	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Case Study-Principal	3	2	1	1	1.75	
	Teacher-Principal	3	1	1	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.42	79.2

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	School C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
72	Case Study-Teacher Case Study-Principal Teacher-Principal Average Correspondence	2	3	1	1	1.75	X
73	Case Study-Teacher Case Study-Principal Teacher-Principal Average Correspondence	1 2 2 1.67	1 3 3 2.33	1 1 1 1.00	1 1 2 1.33	1.00 1.75 2.00 1.58	71.8
74	Case Study-Teacher Case Study-Principal Teacher-Principal Average Correspondence	1 1 1 1.00	1 1 1 1.00	1 1 1 1.00	1 1 1 1.00	1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	100.0
75	Case Study-Teacher Case Study-Principal Teacher-Principal Average Correspondence	1 1 1 1.00	1 1 1 1.00	1 1 1 1.00	1 1 1 1.00	1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	100.0
76	Case Study-Teacher Case Study-Principal Teacher-Principal Average Correspondence	1 1 1 1.00	2 2 3 2.33	3 3 3 3.00	1 1 1 1.00	1.75 1.75 2.00 1.83	58.3
77	Case Study-Teacher Case Study-Principal Teacher-Principal Average Correspondence	1 1 1 1.00	1 3 3 2.33	1 3 3 2.33	3 3 1 2.33	1.50 2.50 2.00 2.00	50.0

TABLE IX (Continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	School C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
78	Case Study-Teacher	1	2	1	1	1.25	83.3
	Case Study-Principal	1	2	1	1	1.25	
	Teacher-Principal	1	3	1	1	1.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	2.33	1.00	1.00	1.33	
79	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	100.0
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
80	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	66.7
	Case Study-Principal	1	3	3	1	2.00	
	Teacher-Principal	1	3	3	1	2.00	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	2.33	2.33	1.00	1.67	
81	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	95.8
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1	1	1.00	
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	2	1	1.25	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	1.33	1.00	1.08	
82	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	1	1.00	91.6
	Case Study-Principal	1	2	1	1	1.25	
	Teacher-Principal	1	2	1	1	1.25	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.67	1.00	1.00	1.17	
83	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1	2	1.25	50.0
	Case Study-Principal	1	3	3	2	2.25	
	Teacher-Principal	1	3	3	3	2.50	
	Average Correspondence	1.00	2.33	2.33	2.33	2.00	

TABLE IX (continued)

Question	Type of Correspondence	A	B	School C	D	Average Correspondence	Correspondence Percentage
84	Case Study-Teacher	1	3	1	2	1.75	
	Case Study-Principal	3	1	1	1	1.50	
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	1	3	2.50	
	Average Correspondence	2.33	2.33	1.00	2.00	1.92	54.1
85	Case Study-Teacher	1	3	1			
	Case Study-Principal	3	2	1			
	Teacher-Principal	3	3	1			X
	Average Correspondence	2.33	2.67	1.00			
86	Case Study-Teacher	1	1	1			
	Case Study-Principal	1	1	1			
	Teacher-Principal	1	1	1			X
	Average Correspondence	1.00	1.00	1.00			

*Correspondence Percentage denoted by "X" refers to lack of sufficient case study evidence.

Because of the fact that the instrument contains no scale nor elements of correctness, the split-half method, which involves relating alternate items to a scaled criterion, cannot be employed. Equivalent forms do not exist, to the knowledge of the investigator.

The use of the test-retest method, while apparently plausible, is not in actuality. As previously discussed, the behaviors of the four principals had undergone change during the period of the year's study. (The extent to which these changes were influenced by the presence of a research team is unknown.) As discussed by Anderson and Anderson:

Although a subject's test performance at different times should be congruent with each other in the sense that they reveal the more central and enduring dimensions of the subject's personality, they should not be expected to show statistical reliability because the subject himself may have changed.⁵

Therefore, two conclusions are set forth: reliability cannot be ascertained until such time as dimensions for behavior and behavior patterns are determined; and, a reliability coefficient would have limited meaning since any interpretation would be limited by a lack of ability to ascertain whether the discrepancy between the coefficient and perfection is attributable to a weakness in the instrument or changes in behaviors on the part of the subjects.

⁵Anderson and Anderson, op. cit., p. 39.

1/200
PARA
SCALE
ANALYSIS

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER APPLICATION OF INSTRUMENT

A. Introduction

An instrument designed to attain an educational objective can never truly be said to have been developed to a final, perfected stage. Techniques always remain which, if employed, can further development. The findings of this study will, therefore, lead to recommendations for further instrument development.

This instrument was presented for the specific purpose of aiding the Kellogg Leadership Study at the University of Florida in its attempt to test its major hypothesis (see Chapter I). However, the recommendations for further study are directed toward other purposes, as well. This chapter presents recommendations for the use of the instrument in both the second phase of the Kellogg Leadership Study and in other areas of education.

B. Summary of Findings

1. School principals using this instrument were able to describe their behaviors in key situations with a relatively high degree of correspondence to the evidence of their behaviors gathered by investigators. In approximately seven out of ten situations presented, four selected

principals described their behaviors in agreement with the evidence (see Chapter V, Table VII).

2. Selected teachers using the instrument were more capable of providing accurate descriptions of the behaviors of their school principals than were the principals. Five teachers selected by their principal on the basis of criteria of (1) teacher knowledge of his work, and (2) objectivity, proved 85 per cent accurate in describing the behaviors of their principal (see Table VII).

3. The degree of rapport did not significantly affect the responses of teachers and principals to the instrument. The per cent of agreement between teachers and a principal in a non-rapport school was within the same range as the per cent of agreement in the rapport schools (see Table VIII). The degree of uniformity of all types of agreements, by horizontal and vertical inspections, provides evidence that, on the basis of the limited number of schools compared, results of responses were not affected by the relationship between the administrator of the instrument and the respondents.

4. The behaviors of school principals in selected key situations differed to a relatively high degree. An inspection of the responses by twenty-eight principals to the Principal Behavior Check List revealed that in only six out of eighty-six questions did the responses cluster around one or two of the available choices (see Chapter III, Table II).

5. Tests for the validity of each question (see Chapter V,

Table IX) revealed that eleven out of eighty-six questions failed to meet the criterion of 50 per cent agreement among teachers, principals and evidence gathered by investigators. These tests were made with the results obtained from the four schools studied intensively.

6. A comparison between those questions failing to meet the criterion for behavior discrimination among principals and the criterion for question validity revealed that three questions failed to meet the criteria for both sets of data (see Chapter V, Section C, 5).

C. Recommendations for Administration of Instrument and

Further Study

The findings of this study lend themselves to recommendations for the following year's research study in the schools of a Florida county. The following suggestions are proposed for the consideration of the researcher who utilizes this instrument and for other members of the University of Florida Leadership Study:

1. Administration of Instrument.

Due to the fact that five selected teachers were more capable of describing their principal's behavior than he was, it is suggested that the next researcher administer the instrument to the teachers.

On the basis of this study, procedure consistency dictates that the researcher inform the principal of the purpose of the instrument and that the principal select five teachers consistent with the criteria of

selection discussed in Chapter V. In discussing the purpose of the instrument, it is advisable that the principal be given to understand that a knowledge of his behavior with pupils, teachers, and community members is desired.

In explaining the nature of the task to the teacher respondents, the principal should not be present, nor should he be included in any way in this phase of the research other than in the selection of the teachers. The principal's presence may introduce an element of threat.

Whereas the initial pages of the instrument provide instructions and examples for respondents, it is advisable that the investigator read them with the respondents and answer any questions they may have. (Previously, instructions were explained to teachers, both individually, and in groups. The group approach proved more gratifying to teachers and to the researcher and provided an economy of time. However, there appears to be no evidence to support a contention that either approach will affect the quality of responses.)

To be consistent with previous procedures of administering the instrument, the researcher should suggest that each teacher place himself in the role of his principal and respond as the principal would if he accurately reported his behaviors in each situation. The first two questions should be responded to in the presence of the researcher to insure, for the benefit of all concerned, that the instructions are understood. It should be made clear to teachers that they are to respond to

every question.

Prior to his departure, the researcher should suggest that teachers not attempt to respond during a continuous block of time. (Past respondents, in discussing a fatigue factor, suggested that responses may have been affected by attempts to complete the task by continuous application.) The researcher should provide stamped, self-addressed envelopes for mailed returns and assure teachers, early and late in the orientation, that the results of their perceptions of the principal's behavior will be kept confidential. (There is no need for teachers to identify themselves on the instrument form.)

2. Preliminary Data.

The preliminary data requested of respondents (see Form C) were included for purposes of future study should relationships emerge that might reveal significance between patterns of behavior and facts about the school (e. g. enrollment, the number or types of standing committees, etc.). Significant relationships may be gleaned from comparing the preliminary data with situations that deal with committees and faculty meetings (see Questions 20-29) and may form a basis for future sub-form analysis.

An example of how such a relationship may be sought would be to test the extent to which principals in schools with large student enrollments differ from those with low enrollments in their patterns of

behavior in working with committees. There is any number of possible relationships of this nature. Their use will depend upon the desires of future investigators to test hypotheses of their own choosing.

3. Interpretation of Responses

The procedure previously discussed for scoring the instrument when administered to five selected teachers in a school (see Chapter V) should be followed. The first three priority responses to a situation should be utilized and weighted as 3 points, 2 points, 1 point, respectively. The points should be tabulated on a master copy of the instrument and summed. Unless the two behaviors with the highest scores are within a point of each other, the behavior with the most points is selected as most typical. In such cases as might arise where two behaviors receive the same number of points (or are within a single point of each other), and these behaviors have been allotted more points than the others, they should be equally designated as most typical.

The need for discretion (where two behaviors are one or one-half point apart) is based upon the contention that they are reasonably identical as the most typical behaviors of the principal and is interpreted as having been so designated by the teachers. This was the basis for assigning priority responses in testing for validity (see Chapter V, Tables III-VI). The need to maintain consistency dictates a continuation of this scoring procedure.

4. Reducing the Size of the Instrument.

The findings related to behavior distributions and question validity (see above) do not result in a recommendation to eliminate questions for reducing the size of the instrument at this time. Were the samples for behavior distribution (twenty-eight) and question validity (four) larger, such a recommendation would be made. Were there a sufficient number of questions revealing both unsatisfactory behavior distributions and low validity per cents, a sounder basis for shortening the Principal Behavior Check List would exist.

Two procedures for shortening the instrument at a later date are recommended. They are:

a. Increase the size of the sample of twenty-eight to fifty or more principals. Unsatisfactory distributions, i. e., behavior groupings wherein one or two behaviors are selected by a large number of respondents, will reveal those situations that do not present sufficient discriminations of behaviors among principals.

b. Scale the behaviors in each grouping so that extremes of behavior are revealed (see below for recommended method of scaling by dimensions). Items may then be analyzed for discrimination power. This theory is discussed (Hawkes, Lindquist, and Mann¹) and examples of its application are furnished by Adorno.²

¹Herbert E. Hawkes, E. F. Linquist, and C. R. Mann, The Construction and Use of Achievement Examinations, New York: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1936, pp. 41-56.

²Adorno, T. W. et al., The Authoritarian Personality, New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.

5. Behavior Patterns

The objective of determining the patterns of behavior of school principals by means of profiles cannot be feasibly attained at this point in the study. By adhering to the stated limitation that no effort would be made to evaluate or scale behaviors (see Chapter I), profile interpretations are currently devoid of meaning.

There appears to be two courses of action which may be utilized for revealing behavior patterns. One entails an application of dimensions; the other, a rigorous process of inspection:

a. The recommendation for the application of dimensions of behavior is a result of the investigator's inspection of the final instrument following the inductive process of instrument development. This is in contrast to Seaman's approach of hypothesizing dimensions.³ Dimensions were not consciously preconceived in the development of the instrument. Therefore, the variables, as represented by the dimensions, tend to overlap in some situations.

The process of arriving at dimensions should not be viewed as exhaustive or conclusive. Following the development and validation of the Principal Behavior Check List, the investigator offers as an aid to the next investigator a tentative basis upon which to proceed towards the identification of behavior patterns. The data that appear below

³Seaman, op. cit., pp. 7-10.

requires further study because all the judgments emanate from the thinking of the writer.

The process of arriving at the assignment of questions to dimensions was performed in three steps:

1. An inspection of all the situations and behavior groupings of the instrument to select and define the discriminating dimensions.
2. A re-inspection of the instrument to assign each situation and its behavior grouping to one or more of the selected dimensions.
3. An analysis of the assignments to determine the extent of mutual independence or discrimination between the selected dimensions.

Inspection revealed that the situations and their respective behaviors provided insights into the variables of directness, control, isolation, and change. A degree of similarity was found to exist between these and two of Seaman's relations, viz.; control and domination, and isolation and separatism. A third dimension proved to be identical, viz., change. It is significant to note that, on a basis of item inter-correlation, Seaman found that change showed the clearest overlap⁴ with other dimensions. This is consistent with the finding of this study (see Table X) which results in the recommendation to employ the first three named dimensions.

The researcher, in referring to the dimensions, defined them

⁴Ibid., p. 30.

as follows:

Directness-Apathy. The extent to which the principal initiates decisive action in a given situation.

Control-Delegation. The extent to which the principal confines the decision-making power of teachers, pupils, and/or parents, in a given situation.

Isolation-Membership. The extent to which the principal limits his interactions with teachers, pupils, or community members in a given situation.

Change-Status Quo. The extent to which the principal's behavior, in a given situation, is indicative of a willingness to accept alterations in his behavior and the functioning of the school.

As a result of inspection by the investigator, questions have been assigned to the dimensions as follows:

ASSIGNMENT OF QUESTIONS TO DIMENSIONS

<u>Directness</u>		<u>Control</u>		<u>Isolation</u>	<u>Change</u>
1	71*	3	58	7*	3*
2	72	4	61*	8	4*
9	73	5	62*	21*	6*
10	75	6	67**	24*	22*
11	76	7*	68**	57	28*
12	77*	14*	74	59	29*
13	78*	15*	77*	60	32*
14*	83	16*	78*	63*	33*
15*	84	19*	79	69*	34*
16*	85	20*		70*	36*
17	86	21*		71*	37*
18		22		80	38*
19*		23*		81	39*
20*		25*		82	47*
23*		26*			48*
24*		27*			49*
25*		28			50*
26*		29			52*
27*		30			67**
37*		31			68**
40		32			83*
41		33			84*
42		34			
43		35			
44*		36			
45*		38			
46		39			
55*		44*			
56*		45*			
61*		47			
62*		48			
63*		49			
64		50			
65		51			
66		52			
67**		53			
68**		54			
69*		55*			
70*		56*			

* Two-dimension dependence

** Three-dimension dependence

The assignment of questions to dimensions may be viewed in the light of their independence as variables, i. e. the extent to which a question relates to a single dimension (see Table X). The assumption is made that a dimension has no significant value for the determination of behavior patterns unless a relatively high degree of independence exists between it and each of the other dimensions. (The ideal method of analysis for testing the degree of independence would be an item analysis and dimension intercorrelation -- a technique that requires the application of "high" and "low" scores. Such scores cannot be determined at the present stage of instrument development.)

It may be noted that the principal's behaviors in treating pupil suggestions (see Form C, Question 3) include such possibilities as acting upon suggestions, if acceptable to him, or rejecting them, if unacceptable to him. Such behaviors appear to reveal elements of his maintaining control. On the other hand, the principal may encourage pupils to present such suggestions to the student council or he may present them himself. These behaviors appear to reveal a tendency on the part of the principal to delegate responsibility and authority to representatives of the student body for determining the value of the suggestions.

The same situation presents the possibilities of the principal rarely being confronted with such suggestions and encouraging a pupil to bring his suggestions before his class. On the other hand, the principal may suggest that they be brought to the student council by him or by the

pupil. The former behaviors appear to indicate that the opportunities for such suggestions are either not provided or that they are referred to a student group that is deprived of school-wide decision making authority. The latter behaviors indicate that the principal has not hindered the formation of a school-wide decision-making group and encourages the use of such channels for effecting change. This question was, therefore, assigned to the dimensions of control and change (see Assignment of Questions by Dimensions) and provides one example of the dependence of two dimensions in question assignment.

Another example is furnished by the situation that deals with a principal's behavior when he is confronted by a committee recommendation which he believes to be detrimental to the school (see Form C, Question 14). By modifying or discarding the recommendation, he exercises control. By suggesting a modification to the committee or faculty, as a whole, and accepting their decision, he appears to be delegating authority to them for making the decision. However, directness is involved when he discards the recommendation by refusing to explain his reasons for doing so. By letting it come before the faculty and allowing a decision to take place without his participation or expression of views, the principal appears to be apathetic.

A third example of dimension dependence is revealed by the way the principal works with teacher committees (see Form C, Question 24). By not participating with them, he exhibits isolate behavior. As a leader

TABLE X
MUTUAL INDEPENDENCE OF SELECTED DIMENSIONS OF BEHAVIOR

Dimension	Number Assigned Questions	Directness		Control		Isolation		Change		Mean Pct. Indep.
		No. Indep.	Pct.	No. Indep.	Pct.	No. Indep.	Pct.	No. Indep.	Pct.	
Directness	50			31	62.0	45	90.0	47	94.0	82.0
Control	48	29	60.4			46	95.8	29	60.4	72.2
Isolation	14	9	64.3	12	85.7			14	100.0	83.3
Change	22	19	86.4	3	13.6	22	100.0			66.7

or a group member, he appears to exhibit membership tendencies.

The listing of questions by dimensions and the table that presents mutual independence (see Table X) reveal that none of the questions assigned to the dimension of change are independent of other dimension assignments (and are unusually dependent with regards to control). This factor, in addition to the result revealing that change possesses the lowest mean percentage of independence of the four dimensions, provides a fairly sound basis for the exclusion of this dimension.

The exploration into dimensions of behavior results in recommendations that:

1. Further study be made by the next researcher of the inspections of the instrument made by the writer to arrive at dimensions.
2. Unless changes in the dimensions, themselves, appear desirable, the researcher utilize a select group of judges to determine a single dimension assignment for all questions assigned to two dimensions. (This step, while not essential, will lessen the expenditure of time for scaling and is offered as an alternative to scaling those questions dependent upon two dimensions.)

3. The researcher utilize the method employed by Thurstone,⁵ (or some other authoritative method), to scale the behaviors,⁶ in each

⁵L. L. Thurstone and E. J. Chave, The Measurement of Attitude, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

⁶The scaling of behaviors in accordance with dimensions is not recommended as a means of placing values upon them. The dimensions have not been suggested as bases for evaluative criteria.

situation by applying the dimensions that have been accepted after further study.

4. The researcher record the behaviors of the extended sampling of school principals to profile charts by the sub-areas (e.g. principal behavior relating to community members) of principal relationships (see below).

As a result of following these recommendations, the writer believes that the behavior patterns of principals will be revealed.

b. The second course of action pertains to the use of the sampling of principals and a process of seeking trends in behavior responses. The task appears to be a most time consuming one unless a mechanical aid is applied. The size of the instrument presents a problem, both for seeking behavior pattern trends by inspection and utilizing a mechanical aid.

After the instrument has been reduced sufficiently in size, behavior pattern trends may be discerned by the use of an IBM machine. The first priority responses of the sampling of fifty or more principals may be assorted so that trends will indicate that principals, by groups, differentiate from each other.

The process of locating trends may be attainable by inspection. This will entail a rigorous process of following up each grouping of principals who respond identically to a given situation and then seeking other behaviors agreed upon by the same principals. The task may be eased

by limiting the inspection to the sub-areas of principal relationships.

(One such attempt was made by the investigator. It met with no success. However, prior to arriving at a reasonable conclusion, the recommendation is made for further exploration.)

The final form of the instrument includes situations that apply to more than one sub-area of principal relationships. Hence, the list that follows does not total to the eighty-six which represents the number of situations:

ASSIGNMENT OF QUESTIONS TO SUB-AREAS OF PRINCIPAL RELATIONSHIPS

<u>Individual Teachers</u>		<u>Teacher Groups</u>		<u>Students</u>	<u>Community Members</u>
4*	74	1	79*	3	5
12*	75	2	80	6	16**
13*	76	4*	81	7	40
14*	77	19*	82*	8	41
15*	78*	20	83	9	42*
16**	82*	21	84*	10	43*
18		22		11	44*
36*		23		12*	45*
37*		24		13*	46
38		25		14*	47
42*		26		15*	48*
43*		27		16**	49*
44*		28		17	50
45*		29		19*	51
56		30		32	52*
58*		31		33	53
61		33		85*	54
62		34		86*	55
63		35			57
64		36*			58*
65		37*			59
66		39			60
68*		48*			79*
69		49*			84*
70		52*			85*
71		67			86*
72		68*	* Question assigned to two sub-areas		
73		78*	** Question assigned to three sub-areas		

The assignment of questions to sub-areas are based on a priori grounds. The judgments are made by the investigator.

If we examine the possible behaviors associated with a principal's attempts to get teachers to join professional organizations (see Form C,

Question 1), it becomes evident that all relate to teachers and most pertain to the faculty, as a whole. Hence, this is designated as principal behavior relating to teachers as groups (see Assignment of Questions to Sub-Areas).

The distinction between sub-areas is not always reconciled as easily. Whereas most of the behaviors that deal with how the principal treats individual teacher suggestions for improving the school refer to teachers as groups, all do not, and, due to the nature of the situation, a single teacher is involved in the immediate relationship. (See Form C, Question 4). Therefore, this situation is assigned to the two sub-areas relating to teachers (see Assignment of Questions to Sub-Areas).

The situation relating to principal-parent-pupil conferences dealing with a discipline problem (see Form C, Question 16) results in the only assignment to three sub-areas. Five behaviors involve other staff members (d, e, f, k, l), and the writer holds to the contention that the decision resulting from such a conference is of vital concern to the teacher responsible for the pupil.

Table XI reveals a high degree of sub-area independence. All mean percentages of independence are above 80. The lowest degrees of independence are found in relating each of the areas of students and community members to teachers as individuals, and these percentages are above 70. There appears to be ample evidence to support a recommendation that, because of the mutual independences of sub-areas, they

TABLE XI

MUTUAL INTERDEPENDENCE OF SELECTED SUB-AREAS OF PRINCIPAL RELATIONSHIPS

Sub-Area	Number Assigned Questions	Teachers as Individuals		Teachers as Groups		Students		Community Members		Mean Pct. Interp.
		No.	Interp. Pct.	No.	Interp. Pct.	No.	Interp. Pct.	No.	Interp. Pct.	
Teachers as Individuals	34			28	82.3	29	85.3	28	82.3	83.3
Teachers as Groups	34	26	82.3			33	97.3	30	88.2	89.2
Students	18	13	72.2	17	95.0			15	83.3	83.3
Community Members	26	20	76.9	21	80.8	23	86.5			82.1

be utilized without the need for further study.

D. Implications for Use of Instrument

1. Introduction

The extensive phase of instrument development, while undertaken for the primary purpose of providing an instrument for future use by the University of Florida research staff, has served to provide an instrument for broader use and purpose. The final phase of this writing is, therefore, devoted to presenting implications for use of the instrument as it pertains, specifically, to the University of Florida Kellogg Leadership Study and, generally, to other educational purposes.

2. Implications for Use of Instrument in University of Florida Leadership Study

This study was undertaken for the explicit purpose of developing an instrument so that future investigators of the University of Florida research staff could (1) discover the practices of school principals and (2) seek relationships between these practices and phases of the school program (see Chapter I; Phases I, II, III of the design of the University of Florida Leadership Study). The second phase of the University of Florida Study, i. e., discovering the behavior patterns of school principals, can be accomplished by following the recommendations in this chapter, administering the Principal Behavior Check List (see Appendix C, Form C) to a large group of school principals, and treating the data.

3. Other Implications for Use of Instrument

a. Use in Self-Evaluation

As a result of sampling the twenty-eight principals, a further use of the instrument was revealed as one of self-analysis of behavior. The seminars with two groups of principals (included as part of the sampling), while designed to reveal instrument weaknesses, resulted in some positive statements about the instrument's value. One principal, in questioning the method of arriving at behaviors, commented to the effect that he was never aware of the numerous courses of action pursued by principals in some of the situations presented. A second principal stated, "This is a good thing to have for reference in your desk drawer when a disturbed parent or teacher comes barging in."

A principal in another county, when returning a completed copy of the instrument, commented that, "This was the best exercise I ever had in analyzing what I do." Other positive statements were made by respondents to attest to the value of the instrument for self-analysis by a comparison of verbalized philosophies of behavior with actual practices.

b. Use by Central Office Personnel in City or County School Systems

The comparison of verbalized philosophies of behavior with actual practices is often furthered in a group situation. A superintendent

who requested a number of copies of the instrument is currently applying them with his school principals in pre-planning conferences. He is utilizing the forms for the purpose of an objective appraisal of existing behaviors in group meetings with the principals and is making efforts to remove the onus of "correct" behaviors in his process.

In effect, this, too, is designed as a self-evaluative process by use of the group as a medium to focus on behaviors. Hence, superintendents and supervisors may find a use for the instrument in conferences with groups of principals for an objective appraisal of behaviors in key situations.

c. Use in College of Education Classes

The instrument offers an opportunity for instructors in teacher training institutions to focus on leadership behavior. An instructor of administration and supervision classes can utilize it in group work or administer it at the beginning and end of a semester to ascertain growth. (The later procedure pre-supposes preferable behaviors and will not be applicable for the stated purpose until the findings of the third year of The University of Florida Leadership Study are revealed.)

An instructor of a teacher's college class in New York has recently used the instrument and found it valuable for exploring behaviors with school administrators. He stated that, in their evaluation of the instrument, students discovered the existence of procedures that

they had not been aware of in their previous practices as school leaders.

A psychology instructor in Kentucky is currently attempting to develop the instrument by exploring its value on a single dimension basis. He intends to explore it further with students in educational administration classes during and after the scaling of behaviors.

4. Conclusion

The possibilities forwarded for some uses of the instrument are based upon limited knowledge. The purposes, other than those related to the University of Florida Study, reflect the views of the writer and a few other individuals. They may result, in part, from a desire to see the study utilized on a broader scale than that upon which it was intended to serve. There is no evidence to confirm the extent to which these purposes can be served by the use of the Principal Behavior Check List; such evidence awaits further application and study of the instrument.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adkins, Dorothy C., "The Validity of Written Tests for the Selection of Administrative Personnel," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 6:1946, pp. 293-313
- Adorno, T. W., et al., The Authoritarian Personality, New York: Harper and Bros., 1950
- Anderson, Harold H. and Anderson, Gladys L., An Introduction to Projective Techniques, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951, pp. 39, 47
- Ascher, Charles S., "Human Relations in Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 34, no. 5: Feb., 1953, pp. 175-177
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Group Processes in Supervision, Washington, D. C.:NEA, 1948
- Bales, Robert F., Interaction Process Analysis, Cambridge:Addition-Wesley Press, 1950
- Barnard, C. I., The Functions of the Executive, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950
- Bavelas, A., "Leaders Can Be Trained," The Association Forum, 23: Nov.-Dec., 1942
- Benne, Kenneth D. and Muntyan, Bozidar, Human Relations in Curriculum Change, New York: Dryden Press, 1951
- Bowers, Paul, "What Practices Have Proven Most Helpful in Developing Better Student-Teacher Relationships?" National Association of Secondary School Principals, 37: April, 1953, pp. 11-13
- Brokaw, Leland D., "Comparative Validities of 'Short' versus 'Long' Tests," Journal of Applied Psychology, 35: Oct. 1951, pp. 325-330
- Carter, L. F. and Nixon, J., "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Four Criteria of Leadership Ability for Three Different Tasks," Journal of Psychology, 27: 1949, pp. 245-261

- Charters, W. W. Jr., "The School as a Social System," Review of Educational Research, vol. 21, no. 1; 1952, pp. 41-50
- Chase, Stuart, Roads to Agreement, New York: Harper and Bros., 1951
- Cronbach, Lee J., Essentials of Psychological Testing, New York: Harper and Bros., 1949
- Crombach, Lee J. and Warrington, Willard G., "Efficiency of Multiple Choice Tests as a Function of the Spread of Item Difficulties," Psychometrika, 17: June, 1952, pp. 127-147
- De Huszar, G. B., Practical Applications of Democracy, New York: Harper and Bros., 1942
- Department of Education of the State of Georgia, School Leaders Manual, Atlanta, Georgia: State Department of Education, 1947
- Department of Elementary School Principals, In-Service Growth of School Personnel, Twenty-first Yearbook, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1946
- Domas, Simeon J., Report of An Exploratory Study of Teacher Competence Cambridge, Mass.: New England School Development Council, Peabody House, 1950
- Eaton, Joseph W., "Experiments in Testing for Leadership," American Journal of Sociology, 52:1947, pp. 523-535
- Ebel, Robert L., "Construction and Validation of Educational Tests," Review of Educational Research, 20, Feb. 1950, pp. 87-97
- Fleischman, Edwin A., "Leadership Climate and Supervisory Behavior," Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board Monograph (Multilithed), 1951
- Ford, R. N., "Scaling Experience by a Multiple-Response Technique: A Study of White-Negro Contacts," American Sociological Review, vol. 6, no. 1, Feb. 1941, p. 21
- French, John R. P. Jr., "The Description and Cohesion of Groups," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 36: 1941, pp. 361-378

- Gibb, Cecil A., "The Sociometry of Leadership in Temporary Groups," Sociometry, 13: 1950, pp. 226-243
- Gilchrist, Robert S., "What Administrative Policies Promote Good Principal-Faculty Relations?" National Association of Secondary School Principals, 37: April, 1953, pp. 46-48
- Guilford, J. P., Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1950
- Hamilton, C. Horace, "Bias and Error in Multiple Choice Items," Psychometrika, 15: June, 1950, pp. 151-167
- Hanawalt, N. G. and Richardson, H. M., "Leadership as Related to the Bernreuter Personality Measures: IV. An Item Analysis of Responses of Adult Leaders and Non-Leaders," Journal of Applied Psychology, 28: 1944, pp. 397-441
- Hartley, Eugene L. and Hartley, Ruth E., Fundamentals of Social Psychology, New York: Knopf, 1952
- Hawkes, Herbert E., Lindquist, E. F., and Mann, C. R., The Construction and Use of Achievement Examinations, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1936, pp. 41-56
- Hemphill, John K., "Group Factors in Leadership I: Relation Between the Size of the Group and the Behavior of 'Superior Leaders,'" Journal of Social Psychology, 32: 1950, pp. 11-22
- Hemphill, John K., Situational Factors in Leadership, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1949
- Homans, George O., The Human Group, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950
- Hopkins, L. Thomas, Interaction: The Democratic Process, New York: D. C. Heath and Co., 1941
- Jahoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook, Stuart W., Research Methods in Social Relations, 2 vols., New York: Dryden Press Inc., 1951
- Jenkins, W. O., "A Review of Leadership Studies with Particular Reference to Military Problems," Psychological Bulletin, 44: 1947, pp. 54-79

- Jennings, Helen H., Leadership and Isolation, New York: Longmans Green, 1947
- Jordan, A. M., Measurements in Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1953, p. 15
- Kelley, Earl C., Education for What Is Real, New York: Harper and Bros., 1947
- Lewin, Kurt, A Dynamic Theory of Personality, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1935
- Lewin, Kurt, "Dynamics of Group Action," Educational Leadership, 1: 1944, pp. 195-200
- Lewin, Kurt, "A Research Approach to Leadership Problems," Journal of Educational Sociology, 17: 1944, pp. 392-398
- Lewin, Kurt, Resolving Social Conflicts: Selected Papers on Group Dynamics; New York, Harper, 1948
- Lewin, Kurt, Lippett, Ronald, and White, Ralph K., "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates," Journal of Social Psychology, May, 1939
- Lippett, Ronald, "An Experimental Study of the Effect of Democratic and Authoritarian Group Atmosphere," Studies in Topological and Vector Psychology, University of Iowa, Studies in Child Welfare, 16: 1940, pp. 43-195
- Lippett, Ronald, and White, R. K., An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life, In Newcomb, T. and Hartley, E. (eds.) Readings in Social Psychology, New York: Holt, 1947
- Lippett, Ronald and White, R. K., "Individual Differences as Related to Autocratic and Democratic Group Atmosphere," Psychological Bulletin 36: July, 1939, p. 558
- Lord, Frederick M., "An Investigation of the Relation of the Reliability of Item Difficulties," Psychometrika, 17: June, 1952, pp. 181-194
- Mandell, Milton M., "The Administrative Judgement Test," Journal of Applied Psychology, 34: June, 1950, pp. 154-147

- Maslow, A. H., "Dominance Feeling, Behavior, and Status," Psychological Review, 44: 1937, pp. 404-429
- Masters, Hugh B., "The C. P. E. A. in 1953," School Executive, vol. 73, no. 5: 1954, pp. 62-64
- Mayo, Elton, "The Fruitful Errors of Elton Mayo," Fortune, Nov., 1946, pp. 181-251
- Mayo, Elton, Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization, Boston: Harvard University Press, 1946
- Mayo, Elton, Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization, Boston: Harvard University, 1945
- Meyer, Herbert H., "Factors Related to Success in the Human Relations Aspect of Work-Group Leadership," Psychological Monographs, 65: No. 3, 1951
- Miel, Alice, Changing the Curriculum, New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1948
- Mode, Elmer B., Elements of Statistics, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951
- Monroe, W. S., Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950
- Moreno, J. L., Who Shall Survive? New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co., 1934
- Morris, Richard T. and Seaman, Melvin, "The Problem of Leadership: An Interdisciplinary Approach," The American Journal of Sociology, 56, no. 2: 1950, pp. 149-155
- Murray, H. A. and MacKinnon, D. W. "Assessment of O. S. S. Personnel," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 10: 1946, pp. 76-80
- National Education Association and Research Center for Group Dynamics, MIT, First National Training Laboratory on Group Development, Bethel, Maine: 1947 (mimeographed)
- National Society for the Study of Education: Thirty-fourth Yearbook, Educational Diagnosis, Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1935, Chapt. VII

- Office of Strategic Services Assessment Staff, Assessment of Men, New York: Rinehart, 1948
- Pierce, Truman and Albright, A. D., "C. P. E. A. in the Southern States," Nation's Schools, L, Oct., 1952, pp. 60-62
- Pigors, Paul, Leadership or Domination, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1935
- Remmers, Hermann H., Educational Measurement and Evaluation, New York: Harper and Bros., 1943
- Research Proposal for the Identification of Effective Educational Administrative Leadership, Gainesville, Fla.: (Mimigraphed), Oct., 1951
- Roethlisberger, F. and Dickson, W., Management and the Worker, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940
- Rogers, Carl R., Counseling and Psychotherapy, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1942
- Ross, C. C., Measurement of Today's Schools, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1947, p. 76
- Ryans, David G. and Frederickson, Norman, "Performance Tests of Educational Achievement," Educational Measurements. Lindquist, E. F. (ed.), Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1951, pp. 455-494
- Seaman, Melvin, "A Status Factor Approach to Leadership," Unpublished Report, Columbus, Ohio: Personnel Research Board, Ohio State University, 1950 (Mimeographed), pp. 5-10, 30
- Sharp, George, Curriculum Development as Re-Education of the Teacher, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951
- Shartte, Carroll L., "Leadership and Executive Performance," Personnel, 25: March, 1949, pp. 370-380
- Simon, Herbert A., Administrative Behavior, New York: Macmillan Co., 1950

- Snygg, Donald and Combs, Arthur, Individual Behavior, New York: Harper and Bros., 1950
- Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, Creative Educational Leadership for a Changing Region, Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1953, pp. 2-3, 26
- Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, Report of the Conference of Directors of Research Projects, Atlanta, Georgia: January 25-30, 1953
- Stogdill, Ralph M., "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," Journal of Psychology, 25: 1948, pp. 35-71
- Stogdill, Ralph M. and Shartle, Carroll L., "Methods for Determining Patterns of Leadership in an Organization Structure," Journal of Applied Psychology, 32: 1948, pp. 286-291
- Stouffer, Sam A., et al., Measurement and Prediction. Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, vol. IV, Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1950
- Thorndike, Robert L., Personnel Selection: Test and Measurement Techniques, New York: J. Wiley, 1949
- Thurstone, L. L. and Chave, E. J., The Measurement of Attitude, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929
- Traxler, Arthur E. and Jacobs, Robert, "Construction and Educational Significance of Structural Inventories in Personality Measurement," Review of Educational Research, 20, Feb. 1950, pp. 38-50
- Tyler, Ralph W., Constructing Achievement Tests, Ohio State University: Bureau of Educational Research, 1934
- Whyte, William Foote, Street Corner Society: the Social Structure of an Italian Slum, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1943
- Wiles, Kimball, Supervision for Better Schools, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950

- Williams, S. B. and Leavitt, H. S., "Methods of Selecting Marine Corps Officer Candidates," In G. A. Kelley (ed.) New Methods in Applied Psychology, College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland, 1947, p. 97
- Yauch, Wilbur, Improving Human Relations in School Administration, New York: Harper and Bros., 1949
- Zeleny, Leslie D., "Status: Its Measurement and Control in Education," Sociometry, 4: 1941, pp. 193-204

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

1. How is the agenda formed for faculty meetings? What do you do?
2. How do you know if a teacher is in the building? Where?
3. How are new teachers selected?
4. What do you do with a teacher who comes to you with a problem?
5. Do you have any specific techniques for discovering teacher difficulties? If so, do you try to do anything about these?
6. How do you participate in a faculty meeting?
7. How do you work with teacher committees?
8. Is there a well recognized system of social control in your faculty? How important are rewards and punishments in this system? What is the principal's role in this system? How is meritorious achievement recognized?
9. How are teachers assigned extra class activity?
10. How is the school schedule formulated?
How is the school budget determined?
11. Do circumstances ever demand that you ignore established school policy?
12. How do you disseminate information from?
 - a. Superintendent's office
 - b. Teacher groups
 - c. Your office
13. In your own schedule, how do you make yourself accessible to teachers?
14. How do you treat teacher suggestions?
15. What use do you make of consultants?
16. How do you reconcile faculty conflicts?
17. What do you regard your social relationship with the faculty to be?
18. For what reasons do you visit the classroom?
19. How do you orientate new teachers?

20. How do you react to teacher opposition?
21. Who makes decisions about school policies?
22. Who makes decisions about program change?
23. How are functions of committees determined?
24. How is committee membership determined?
(Who decides who will be on what committee?)
25. What is done with committee reports?
26. How are policies carried out?
27. When does a committee know that it is ready to make a decision?
28. What division of work is made in committees?
29. Can the principal edit, modify, or veto reports of teacher or pupil groups?
30. Who may use what office facilities and services? (Are there priorities?)
31. What disciplinary procedures are used with pupils? What is the principal's responsibility?
32. Under what circumstances do pupils participate in planning? Does the principal ever plan with pupils?
33. What activities do the principal and pupils share?
34. What school facilities are available to pupils for non-class purposes? Who decides? Who has veto power?
35. Under what circumstances do you participate in pupil-parent conferences? Pupil-teacher conferences? Pupil-pupil conferences?
36. To what extent and how do you work with pupils in the establishment of rules?
37. How do you consider and deal with pupil suggestions?
38. What do you consider your role to be in your personal relationships with pupils?
39. What is your policy regarding visitation by former students of the school?

40. In your opinion, what should be the function of the P.T.A.? To what extent do you participate in P.T.A. activities?
41. What part does the office staff play in community relations? How do you prepare your staff for this?
42. What procedures are followed in working with parents whose children are in difficulty?
43. What is your policy regarding the acceptance of speech-making opportunities?
44. To what extent do you encourage community participation and planning in the school?
45. To what degree do you participate in community affairs?
46. Under what circumstances do you participate in parent-teacher conferences?
47. Who is responsible for the release of school publicity?
48. How do you deal with special interest groups who attempt to influence the school program?
49. How do you deal with personal opposition if it develops in the community?
50. To what extent do you participate in election for persons? Issues?
51. Under what circumstances do you contact parents? By what means is this done?
52. How do you deal with social clubs that may exist in the school?
53. What school facilities are made available to the community?
54. How do students participate in community activities during school hours? After school hours?
55. How, and under what circumstances, do you communicate with the central office?
56. How do you protect teachers from outside pressures? (Cite examples).
57. What other questions might be asked?

APPENDIX B

(Form letter enclosed with each request for return of responses to Form B).

Dear

The enclosed questionnaire is being sent to a selected group of school principals throughout the United States in an attempt to ascertain patterns of leadership. It is part of a Leadership Study sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation and the University of Florida.

This is not an evaluation instrument. There are no correct answers. Your responses and those of others will indicate the possible types of behavior that a school principal can exhibit in given situations and will be used to develop an improved instrument.

As you respond to each question, try to continually bear in mind what or how you do a particular thing. If the activity is not a part of your program or behavior, please state so in every case.

Your name has not been requested. Your responses will not be exhibited. If you desire to see the final form of this instrument, please furnish this request along with your name and address.

If you have any suggestions for improving the instrument, we will appreciate them.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Grades in School Program _____	Approximate Enrollment _____
Population of Community _____	Number of Teachers _____
School Serves _____	

PART I. "PRINCIPAL BEHAVIOR RELATING TO INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS"

1. What is your procedure in the selection of a new teacher?
2. What do you do to help a new teacher become oriented?
3. How do you make yourself accessible to teachers for conferences?
4. What is your usual procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about a discipline problem?
5. What is your usual procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about a problem involving another teacher?

6. What is your usual procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about a personal problem?
7. What is your usual procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about a parent problem?
8. What is your usual procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about a problem concerning school policy?
9. What is your usual procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about an instructional problem?
10. What is your usual procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about any other problem not mentioned above?
11. How do you determine what your teachers are teaching?

12. How do you determine what methods your teachers utilize?
13. How do you determine when to visit classrooms?
14. What do you do when you visit a classroom?
15. Are there any procedures, not mentioned above, that you utilize to assist a teacher to improve her teaching?
16. How do you go about trying to improve a teacher's work when the teacher does not ask for help?
17. How do you rate your teachers?
18. How do you reward a teacher for good work?

19. How do you deal with the teacher who does something that you feel is annoying or harmful?
20. What procedures do you use in refusing to rehire a teacher or effect dismissal?
21. How do you treat teacher suggestions made to you in a private conference involving the school as a whole?
22. How do you treat teacher suggestions made to you in a private conference that involve the teacher making the suggestion?
23. How do you react to an individual teacher's opposition to your ideas or methods?
24. How do you react to an individual teacher's opposition to a teacher group's decision?

25. How do you attempt to protect teachers from outside pressures that take place during the routine school schedule?
26. How do you attempt to protect teachers from outside pressures that evolve from an individual parent's pressure?
27. How do you attempt to protect teachers from outside pressures that evolve from a parent or community group?
28. What do you do to prepare the secretarial staff for working with pupils and the community?
29. What do you do to make the custodian part of the school program?
30. What do you do to make the bus drivers part of the school program?

NAME (Fill in only if you desire final form) _____

Grades in School Program _____	Approximate Enrollment _____
Population of Community School Serves _____	Number of Teachers _____

PART II. "PRINCIPAL BEHAVIOR RELATING TO TEACHERS AS GROUPS"

1. What do you do to discourage teachers from joining a teacher organization that you believe to be harmful?
2. What do you do to get teachers to join professional organizations?
3. How do you determine the assignments of extra-class activities?
4. How do you determine teacher class and grade schedules?
5. How do you determine the use of internal funds?

6. Where do you draw the line on personal-social relationships with the faculty during the school day?
7. Where do you draw the line on personal-social relationships with the faculty after school hours?
8. What are the jobs of the people you most often eat lunch with?
9. At what position of the table do you usually sit when eating lunch with school personnel?
10. What do you do in forming the agenda for faculty meetings?
11. How do you participate in a faculty meeting?

12. Where do you usually sit in the faculty meetings?
13. How do you determine the need for a faculty committee?
14. How do you work with the faculty planning committee or faculty council?
15. How do you work with other committees?
16. How do you determine functions of committees?
17. How do you determine the functions of committee members?
18. How do you determine who will be on a committee?

19. What do you do with a committee report or recommendation?
20. What do you do with a report or recommendation when you believe that it is not for the best interests of the school?
21. How do you determine when a committee or the faculty, as a whole, is ready to make a decision?
22. How did you arrive at your school policies?
23. Under what circumstances do you find it necessary to make decisions contrary to school policy?
24. What do you do when the faculty questions your decisions?

25. What do you do when teachers violate school policy?
26. If you have any experimental work in progress what did you do to promote it?
27. What do you do to establish subject standards?
28. What do you do to bring about changes in course offerings or content?
29. What steps do you take to solve a school wide discipline problem that teachers identify?
30. What steps do you take to solve a school wide discipline problem that you identify?

31. What do you do to get teachers to evaluate their progress as a total faculty?
32. What do you do to get teachers to evaluate program changes?
33. How do you evaluate the human relationships in your school?

NAME (Fill in only if you desire final form) _____

Grades in School Program _____	Approximate Enrollment _____
Population of Community School Serves _____	Number of Teachers _____

PART III. "PRINCIPAL BEHAVIOR RELATING TO STUDENTS"

1. What do you do when a teacher tells you about the misbehavior of a single student?
2. What do you do when a teacher sends a student to you?
3. What do you do when you personally observe a student infraction and no teacher is present?
4. What do you do when you observe a student infraction but the responsible teacher present does not act?
5. What do you do when you learn of a teacher's class getting out of hand?

6. What steps do you take when the misbehavior of a group of pupils away from the school is reported to you?
7. What step do you take when you observe a group of pupils misbehaving away from the school?
8. How do you treat pupil suggestions involving the school as a whole?
9. How do you treat pupil suggestions involving the pupil making the suggestion?
10. Where do you draw the line on personal-social relationships with pupils?
11. When do you bring pupils into planning with you?

12. What role, if any, do you play in this planning together?
13. What do you do if pupils make a decision that you believe is detrimental to the best interests of those concerned?
14. What activities aside from pupil planning do you share with pupils?
15. How do you arrive at any rules and regulations concerning students?
16. What use, if any, do you make of student talent or labor in the school?
17. What use, if any, do you make of student talent or labor outside of school?

18. How do you determine when to use students?
19. How do you determine which students will be utilized?
20. What procedure do you find most helpful in parent-pupil conferences in dealing with a promotion or demotion problem?
21. What procedure do you find most helpful in parent-pupil conferences in dealing with future education, transfer of school, future vocation, etc.
22. What procedure do you find most helpful in parent-pupil conferences in dealing with a serious discipline problem?
23. When you have a pupil-teacher conference, what procedure do you usually follow on a promotion or demotion problem?

24. When you have a pupil-teacher conference, what procedure do you usually follow on a discipline problem?
25. What procedure do you follow in pupil-parent-teacher conferences?
26. How do you participate in pupil-pupil conferences?
27. How do you deal with social cliques (clubs that may become cliques, sororities and fraternities, etc.) that exist with students in the school?

NAME (Fill in only if you desire final form) _____

Grades in School Program _____	Approximate Enrollment _____
Population of Community School Serves _____	Number of Teachers _____

PART IV. "PRINCIPAL BEHAVIOR RELATING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS"

1. What do you do when an irate parent telephones to complain about a teacher's action?
2. What do you do when an irate parent telephones to complain about an action of yours?
3. What do you do when an irate parent comes to your office to complain about a teacher's action?
4. What do you do when an irate parent comes to your office to complain personally about an action of yours?
5. How do you release your school publicity?

6. Under what circumstances do you veto publicity releases?
7. To what extent do you participate in public elections?
8. To what extent do you participate in public issues?
9. For what purposes do you find the need to contact parents?
10. What means do you use for contacting them?
11. How do you use the P.T.A.?
12. What percentage of P. T. A. functions do you attend?

13. How do you get teachers to participate in P. T. A.?
14. For what occasions, do you utilize lay resource people in your education program?
15. How do you determine which community people to ask to assist in the work of the school?
16. How do you use the community in determining school procedures?
17. How do you use the community in planning the school curriculum?
18. How do you use the community in planning special phases of the program such as band, health, sports, dances?
19. How do you use the community in planning school policies?

20. How do you use the community in planning field trips?
21. How do you use the community in planning regarding pre-planning or regular faculty meetings?
22. What is your policy regarding making speeches in the community?
23. What is your policy regarding other staff members making speeches in the community?
24. In what community organizations do you participate actively?
25. What are the community groups where you actually represent the school?

26. How do you deal with special interest groups who attempt to influence the school program among the parents?
27. How do you deal with special interest groups among community organizations who attempt to influence school program?
28. How do you deal with personal opposition in the community from individuals?
29. How do you deal with personal opposition from groups?
30. How do you initiate fund-raising drives?
31. How do you evaluate your school-community relations?

NAME (Fill in only if you desire final form) _____

APPENDIX C

PRINCIPAL BEHAVIOR CHECK LISTPreliminary Data

- A. Principal's Name _____ Grades _____ to _____.
 Name of School _____ Enrollment _____.
 Location of School _____ No. Teachers _____.
- B. (1) What standing or permanent committees are active in your program?
 (Check those of which you are a member; double check those you
 lead.)
- (2) What temporary committees or councils are currently active in
 your program? (Check those of which you are a member; double
 check those you lead.)
- a. Student _____
- b. Teacher _____
- c. Lay _____
- d. Combinations of above _____
- (3) How frequently do you have faculty meetings that:
- a. Are planned meetings on the calendar? _____
- b. Are called by the principal on short notice? _____
- c. Result from a teacher committee or group request? _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read carefully prior to responding to the questions.

1. This instrument is not an evaluation. It is designed to determine the pattern of work of a principal. There are no right or wrong answers and no values have been placed on the items.
2. This instrument seeks to ascertain your typical way of working.
3. There may be several ways you deal with any situation presented. Indicate all the ways you work on each problem by the following responses:

- 1 - most frequently
- 2 - second most frequently
- 3 - etc.
- N - never

Be sure to place an (N) before each choice that does not exhibit your behavior. Hence, every () blank should have some designation when you have completed the instrument.

4. Many questions may not include items which correspond identically with your behavior. In such instances, seek out those responses that most nearly describe it and refrain from writing in any new responses.
5. Be sure to read all items thoroughly. You may find that your behavior is more adequately represented by an overlooked choice.

Examples:

(Question)	(Question)	(Question)
(N) _____	(N) _____	(N) _____
(N) _____	(2) _____	(1) _____
(1) _____	(3) _____	(1) _____
(N) _____	(N) _____	(N) _____
(N) _____	(N) _____	(2) _____
	(1) _____	(N) _____
	(N) _____	(N) _____
	(4) _____	
	(N) _____	

1. What do you do to get teachers to join professional organizations?

- ☐ a. send notes or bulletins to all teachers informing them of the time for payment of dues
- ☐ b. little or nothing
- ☒ c. continually make available the objectives, benefits, and accomplishments of organizations through their publications
- ☐ d. am a life member myself to set an example
- ☐ e. find a way to secure 100% membership; then use this as a basis of precedent and let momentum carry it from year to year
- ☒ f. have an active teacher representative remind teachers to pay dues
- ☒ g. remind negligent ones by notes, bulletins, or personal chats
- ☒ h. sell it in private conferences with teachers
- ☐ i. encourage conference or convention attendance by paying expenses of those who attend from the school budget
- ☒ j. require joining as condition of continued employment
- ☐ k. have faculty decide by majority vote whether they want to have 100% membership
- ☒ l. use faculty meeting time for discussion on merits of joining

2. How do you get teachers to participate in P. T. A.?

- ☒ a. require attendance at meetings
- ☒ b. request that 50% attend each meeting
- ☒ c. allow teachers to decide for themselves
- ☐ d. don't have one
- ☒ e. have parents exert pressures on teachers
- ☒ f. request help and suggestions and involve them in programs
- ☐ g. inform new teachers they are expected to attend; eventually most all teachers accept attendance as part of job
- ☐ h. stress P. T. A. participation in bulletins and faculty meetings

3. How do you treat pupil suggestions for improving the school?

- () a. very little of this
- () b. act on them, if acceptable; explain why if not acceptable
- () c. listen and comment favorably without giving pupil opportunity to take advantage of situation
- () ~~d.~~ encourage students to bring suggestions before student council or other pupil committee
- () ~~e.~~ encourage pupils to bring suggestions up in classes as part of pupil-teacher planning
- () f. I present them to student council for their decision
- () g. I bring them before assembly for analysis by the student body
- () h. I present them to faculty or faculty committee for consideration

4. How do you treat teacher suggestions for improving the school made to you in a private conference?

- () a. try to bring all suggestions before total faculty but time lack causes some to get lost
- () b. accept good ones; offer to bring up for faculty consideration; - tactfully reject poor ones
- () ~~c.~~ suggest that teachers take all such suggestions before designated faculty committee
- () d. bring all such suggestions before designated faculty committee
- () e. bring all suggestions to faculty for consideration
- () f. accept good ones and suggest that teachers bring them before faculty for consideration; tactfully reject poor ones
- () ~~g.~~ suggest teacher take suggestion to faculty for consideration
- () h. accept and adopt good ones; tactfully reject poor ones
- () i. tell teacher that these decisions belong to the central office
- () j. depends on the teacher; try to help put some through; need to tactfully reject suggestions from some teachers

5. How do you release your school publicity?

- ☐ a. some released by students; some by teachers; some by me
- ☐ b. some released by teachers; some by me
- ☐ c. some released by students; some by teachers; all clear with me
- ☐ d. some released by teachers; some by me; all clear with me
- ☐ e. one teacher responsible; clears with me
- ☐ f. teacher publicity committee releases after clearing with me
- ☐ g. department heads responsible; they clear with me
- ☐ h. releases go through my secretary
- ☐ i. maintain responsibility for almost all releases
- ☐ j. one teacher responsible
- ☐ k. department heads responsible
- ☐ l. teacher publicity committee responsible

6. When do you bring pupils into planning with you?

- ☐ a. for any school policy change
- ☐ b. don't or very little pupil planning in school
- ☒ c. for any policy change relating directly to students
- ☐ d. for student rules, regulations, behavior problems
- ☐ e. planning with students handled by teachers and sponsors
- ☐ f. for student clubs, activities, sports
- ☐ g. to involve them in something the staff wishes them to do

7. What role do you play in planning with students?

- ☐ a. don't or very little student planning in school
- ☐ b. rarely plan with students; influence student planning through teachers or student leaders
- ☐ c. planning handled by teachers or sponsors; complete hands-off policy on student planning
- ☐ d. chair; serve as advisor or suggestion giver
- ☐ e. chair; serve as resource person or consultant
- ☐ f. chair; let group go its own way with no influence
- ☐ g. chair; let group go its own way; I influence others outside of meeting
- ☐ h. silent member; I influence through student or teacher leader
- ☒ i. advisor or suggestion giver with student or teacher leader
- ☒ j. serve as resource person or consultant with student or teacher leader
- ☐ k. silent or almost silent member with student or teacher leader

8. What activities, aside from pupil planning, do you share with pupils?
- ☒ a. frequently attend school social activities
 - ☐ b. frequently attend socials away from school
 - ☐ c. guide activities of boys and girls in non-school situations
 - ☒ d. participate in such activities as sports, field trips, instructional dancing, etc.
 - ☐ e. participate in such activities as cleanups, caretaking or beautifying of recreational or landscaping areas
 - ☐ f. participate as a spectator in such activities as movies, sports, dances, etc.
 - ☐ g. student government, panels, and other discussion activities
 - ☐ h. teach one or more classes regularly
 - ☐ i. frequently substitute in classes
 - ☐ j. participate in classes with students as resource person and group member (do not teach)
9. What is your procedure in dealing with disputes which pupils bring to your attention?
- ☐ a. weigh facts and frankly state the right and wrong in the matter; discipline those in the wrong
 - ☐ b. weigh facts and frankly state the right and wrong in the matter; do not rebuke the pupils in any way
 - ☒ c. weigh facts and frankly state the right and wrong in the matter; caution wrong individuals against repeating conduct
 - ☒ d. after hearing facts, summarize for joint solution and suggest one only if necessary
 - ☐ e. guide pupils toward compromise but refrain from making any suggestions
 - ☐ f. refer such disputes to the counselor or another staff member responsible for such situations
 - ☐ g. refer the problem to the student-council
 - ☐ h. complete hands-off policy; stay out of such situations by suggesting that pupils settle them themselves

10. What steps do you take when you observe an unsupervised group of pupils misbehaving away from school?
- () a. stop it; call problem to attention of guidance personnel at school
 - () b. stop it; call problem to attention of faculty at next meeting
 - () c. stop it; call problem to attention of teacher or dean at school for his action
 - () d. stop it; call group in at school for discipline or contact parents
 - () e. stop it; call problem to attention of student council at school for their action
 - () f. stop it; remove the leaders from the scene; arrange later conference with them
 - () g. stop it; remind the group in strong terms of its responsibilities
 - () h. stop it; gently reprimand the group
 - () i. none at that time; call problem to attention of student council at school
 - (5) j. none at the time; call problem to attention of student body at school without reference to names or places
 - () k. none at the time; call to attention of teacher or dean at school for his action
 - () l. none at the time; call problem to attention of faculty at next meeting
 - () m. none at the time; call group in at school for discipline or contact parents
 - () n. none at the time; call problem to attention of guidance personnel at school
 - () o. ignore it

11. What do you do when you observe a student infraction of school rules and no teacher is present?
- () a. ignore it completely
 - () b. ignore it and refer problem to guidance counselor or teacher
 - () c. ignore it and send for student later
 - () d. stop it immediately by questioning or cautioning student
 - () e. stop it immediately by disciplining student
 - (☒) f. stop it immediately by conference with student in another area or office
 - () g. stop it immediately by referring student to guidance counselor or homeroom teacher and investigate later
12. What do you do when you observe a student infraction of school rules but the responsible teacher present does not act?
- (☒) a. call to teacher's attention immediately for his action
 - () b. call student's and teacher's attention to matter immediately
 - () c. correct student immediately
 - () d. correct student immediately and discuss it later with teacher and student together
 - (☒) e. correct student immediately and contact teacher later
 - () f. correct student and bring matter up at the next faculty meeting
 - () g. ignore it completely
 - () h. ignore it and discuss it later with the teacher and student separately
 - () i. ignore it and discuss it later with teacher and student together
 - () j. ignore it and contact teacher later

13. What do you do when a teacher tells you about the misbehavior of a student?

- () ~~a.~~ a. discuss with teacher and advise best solution
- () ~~b.~~ b. discuss with teacher for his decision
- () c. discuss with teacher; then with student and teacher together
(and possibly parent)
- (☒) ~~d.~~ d. discuss with teacher; then with student; then with student and teacher together
- () e. send for student and discuss the problem with him
- () f. send for student and discipline him
- () g. refer problem to staff committee responsible for student misbehavior
- () h. refer problem to staff member responsible for student misbehavior
- () i. get teacher to handle to best of his ability

14. What do you do when a teacher sends a student to you due to his misbehavior?
- (X) a. discuss with student and ask him to suggest corrective measures to be taken
 - () b. discuss with student and advise or caution
 - () c. discuss with student and discipline
 - () d. discuss with student, send note to teacher through student
 - () e. discuss with student; then with student-teacher together
 - (\) f. discuss with student; check back with teacher; take necessary action
 - () g. discuss only with student and teacher together; no prior discussions with either
 - () h. discuss with teacher; then with student and teacher together
 - () / i. discuss with teacher; then with student
 - () j. refer student to grade staff committee
 - () k. refer student to student court or council
 - () l. refer student and teacher to staff member responsible for student misbehavior
 - () m. discourage teacher from isolating pupil from the group for misbehavior

5. What procedures do you employ in pupil-teacher conferences that deal with a discipline problem?

- ☒ a. confer; allow teacher to determine solution
- ☐ b. confer; I decide best solution
- ☒ c. confer; get pupil to suggest solution
- ☐ d. such conferences referred to another staff member
- ☐ e. such conferences referred to a faculty committee
- ☐ f. such conferences referred to a student committee
- ☐ g. don't have need for conferences; reports of offenses result in parent notices; after a few, pupil is suspended
- ☐ h. request that teachers handle such conferences themselves

6. What procedures do you employ in parent-pupil conferences that deal with a discipline problem?

- ☐ a. explain situation; guide discussion so that parent decides
- ☐ b. explain situation; guide discussion so that pupil decides
- ☐ c. explain situation; discuss; advise on best solution
- ☐ d. explain situation; discuss; back teacher decision
- ☒ e. include teachers involved; back teacher decision
- ☒ f. confer but postpone decision; investigate fully and refer emotional problems to community agency or school psychiatrist
- ☐ g. place responsibility on parent by stating the case and school's view; no compromise
- ☐ h. lecture both parent and child on the need for right attitudes
- ☐ i. only conduct such conferences with parent alone
- ☐ j. very rarely or never have such conferences
- ☐ k. such conferences referred to another staff member
- ☐ l. responsibility for such conferences referred to the teachers involved

7. After repeated misbehaviors of a pupil are called to your attention, what is the course of action you pursue?
- ☐ a. misbehaviors referred to another staff member and I never enter into these, no matter how serious
 - ☐ b. refer case to juvenile court
 - ☒ c. suspend the student
 - ☐ d. permanent discharge from school
 - ☒ e. conferences that include parent student, teacher, and/or counselor
 - ☐ f. utilize community welfare agencies or psychiatrist
 - ☐ g. give needed physical punishment
 - ☒ h. deprive pupil of school privileges
 - ☐ i. teacher committee and I make such decisions together
8. What do you do when you learn of a teacher's class getting out of hand?
- ☒ a. confer with teacher and have him evaluate problem
 - ☐ b. confer with teacher and observe or talk with class
 - ☐ c. confer with teacher and point out causes and solution
 - ☐ d. confer with teacher and try to get cooperation of student leaders
 - ☐ e. confer with teacher and discipline student leaders
 - ☒ f. take over the class for brief period
 - ☐ g. make change in schedules for some students or change teacher's schedule
 - ☐ h. talk with class
 - ☐ i. have consultant or supervisor work with teacher
 - ☐ j. talk with class; then confer with teacher
 - ☐ k. observe class, then confer with teacher
 - ☐ l. work with teacher by sharing class work for brief period of time
 - ☐ m. tell teacher he must handle this responsibility
 - ☐ n. talk with class and decide on some form of discipline

9. What steps do you take to solve a large group's or school wide discipline problem?
- () a. call meeting of representative student, teacher, and parent groups
 - () ~~b.~~ b. bring situation before faculty; weigh suggestions; decide on action
 - () c. bring situation before student council with request that they develop new behavior standards
 - () d. take some direct and prompt action such as making a schedule readjustment of establishing a new rule
 - () e. consult with superintendent
 - () f. bring before P. T. A. for discussion and decision
 - () ~~g.~~ g. bring before faculty for discussion and their decision
 - () h. seek solutions from individual teachers; decide on action
 - () i. have student or student-faculty committee investigate and report to total faculty
 - () j. bring before entire student body in an assembly or request class discussions on the topic
 - () k. refer it to a teacher committee
 - () l. bring before student council for recommendations
10. What percentage of the time devoted to faculty meetings do you lead or chair the group?
- () a. 95-100% ✓
 - () b. 65-95% ✓
 - () c. 35-65%
 - () d. 5-35%
 - () e. 0-5%

21. Where do you sit or stand in the faculty meeting?

- () a. sit apart from the group, but not in front, in a row arrangement of seating
- () b. stand at the sides or rear of the room in a row arrangement of seating
- () c. sit anywhere in the front section among teachers, in a row arrangement seating
- () d. stand facing the faculty in a row arrangement of seating
- () e. sit facing the faculty in a row arrangement of seating
- () f. sit in the rear sections of the room among teachers, in a row arrangement of seating
- (✓) g. sit anywhere in a circle or square arrangement of seating
- ()-h. sit or stand at the front of a semi-circle arrangement of seating

22. What do you do in forming the agenda for faculty meetings?

- ☐ a. agenda is formed by a faculty committee; I attend infrequently and accept agenda approved by committee
- ☐ b. agenda is formed by a faculty committee I lead; I make no attempt to influence agenda
- ☐ c. agenda is formed by a faculty committee; I lead and influence agenda
- ☒ d. agenda is formed by a faculty committee; I am a group member with equal voice and vote
- ☐ e. agenda is formed by a faculty committee; I influence through its chairman prior to committee meeting but do not attend the meeting
- ☐ f. I determine agenda after consulting with representative student-faculty committee
- ☐ g. I determine agenda with help of administrative or supervisory committee
- ☐ h. I determine agenda myself
- ☐ i. I determine agenda after teachers submit written suggestions
- ☐ j. I determine agenda after consulting with individual teachers
- ☒ k. I determine agenda but staff brings up items for discussion in meetings

23. How do you determine the need for a faculty committee?

- ☐ a. I determine it when a need arises
- ☒ b. I suggest it for faculty consideration when a need arises
- ☐ c. teacher committee reports or recommendations to faculty lead to needs for other committees
- ☒ d. teacher planning committee suggests it to the faculty when a need arises
- ☐ e. individual teachers suggest it for my consideration
- ☐ f. individual teachers suggest it at a faculty meeting for total consideration

24. How do you work with teacher committees?

- ☒ a. stay away; participate by approving or modifying reports
- ☐ b. stay away; participate only when reports are presented to faculty
- ☐ c. as a leader of committees and consensus seeker
- ☒ d. as a leader of committees; advisor and suggestion giver
- ☒ e. ex-officio member on call by committee and participate as resource consultant when it seems advisable
- ☐ f. as an advisor, suggestion giver, and group member
- ☐ g. as a group member and resource consultant
- ☐ h. as a group member whose role is that of consensus seeker

25. How do you determine the functions of committees?

- ☐ a. I help determine them by exerting initial leadership with committees and get them to focus on their purposes
- ☐ b. I determine by advising the committee or committee chairman
- ☐ c. I determine by leading the committee
- ☒ d. total faculty discussion results in determining committee functions
- ☒ e. designated faculty committee determines the functions of other committees
- ☐ f. committees determine their own functions

26. How do you determine who will be on a committee?
- (✓) a. I determine by considering such factors as interest, ability, load, need for experiences, etc.
 - () b. I suggest names to faculty; then faculty discussion determines
 - () c. accept volunteers first; then my suggestions complete committee
 - (✓) d. accept volunteers first; then faculty suggestions complete committee
 - () e. a faculty committee selects other committee members
 - () f. total faculty suggests committee members until a sufficient number accept
 - () g. faculty members nominate; total faculty votes on nominees
27. How do you determine when a committee or the faculty, as a whole, is ready to make a decision?
- () a. I move for a vote; if they accept the motion, they're ready to decide
 - () b. wait until someone "moves for a vote"; if they accept the motion, they're ready to decide
 - (✓) c. when a member of faculty indicates he feels group is ready for decision
 - () d. when almost all have had their say
 - () e. when I feel that they have revealed the correct data
 - () f. I decide without need for faculty decision

28. What do you do with a committee report or recommendation?

- () a. I accept and implement all committee reports and recommendations
- () b. I accept it for implementation, if feasible; otherwise I modify it or refer it back to committee for further study
- () c. I accept it for faculty discussion and decision, if feasible; otherwise I modify it or refer it back to committee for further study
- (☒)+d. committee brings it before faculty for discussion and decision
- () e. committee brings it before faculty for discussion; then I determine if it can be implemented
- () f. I bring all such reports before the faculty for discussion or decision
- () g. specially delegated faculty committee screens first for acceptance or need for modification; then it is brought to the faculty for discussion or decision
- () h. I bring it before superintendent for his decision if it has any merit

29. What do you do with a committee report or recommendation when you believe that it is not for the best interest of the school?

- ☐ a. bring superintendent into the problem
- ☒ b. modify it
- ☐ c. refer it back to the committee for further study
- ☐ d. suggest modification to committee; if they cannot go along with the modification, accept it
- ☐ e. discard it; no need to explain my position
- ☐ f. discard it after explaining reasons to committee
- ☐ g. discard it after explaining reasons to faculty
- ☐ h. let it come up before the faculty; let faculty discuss it and decide without my participation
- ☒ i. let it come up before the faculty; present my objections; sell the faculty on a need for revision or suggest a modification
- ☒ j. let it come up before the faculty; present my objections; suggest a modification; accept faculty decision

30. How do you determine teacher class and grade schedules?

- ☒ a. I present blank schedule for department or grade committees to work out
- ☐ b. I present blank schedule for faculty volunteers; we discuss and I decide in situations where we can't agree
- ☐ c. I present blank schedule for faculty volunteers; we discuss and I guide but do not decide
- ☒ d. I present tentative schedule; teachers discuss it and agree on changes
- ☐ e. I work with a teacher committee to determine schedules
- ☒ f. I weigh some combination of factors as teacher experience, certification, interest, etc., prior to deciding and secure volunteers where problem is not fully solved
- ☒ g. schedules remain fairly constant; teachers request changes by conferring with me or I request changes of individual teachers when new situations arise

31. How do you determine the assignments of non-class duties and activities?

- () ~~a.~~ I weigh some combination of factors as teacher ability, interest, load, experience, etc., prior to deciding and secure volunteers where problem not fully solved
- () ~~b.~~ I present tentative assignments; teachers discuss it and work out changes
- () c. I present blank schedule for faculty volunteers; I decide assignments only when they can't agree
- () d. I present blank schedule for faculty volunteers; guide but do not decide
- () e. I decide on basis of administrative expediency
- () f. assignments remain fairly constant; teachers confer with me if changes are desired or I request changes for individual teachers when new situations arise
- () ~~g.~~ responsibility for assigning is delegated to a teacher committee
- () ~~h.~~ student-faculty committee submits assignments for approval of teachers involved
- () i. volunteer basis with school paying teachers for any non-class activities
- () ~~j.~~ the faculty sets up a listing of criteria for the assignments and I use this as my basis for decisions
- () k. teachers submit their preferred assignments in writing to me prior to my decisions
- () l. student preference for teachers determine the assignments
- () m. assignments made on basis of alphabetical rotation

32. What do you do if pupils make a decision that you believe is detrimental to the best interests of those concerned?
- ☐ a. let mistake take place; they learn from the experience
 - ☒ b. try out on experimental basis; then evaluate
 - ☐ c. explain unsoundness of decision and seek a compromise
 - ☐ d. explain unsoundness; table the decision for later appraisal
 - ☐ e. explain unsoundness; request change or I veto
 - ☐ f. no explanation necessary; request change or I veto
 - ☐ g. send for parents or teachers to secure their opinions prior to making decision
 - ☐ h. bring superintendent into the problem
33. How do you arrive at your rules and regulations concerning students?
- ☐ a. student council determines; hands-off policy on my part
 - ☐ b. faculty determines; I follow hands-off policy
 - ☒ c. faculty and student council determines with my participation
 - ☒ d. a student-faculty committee determines
 - ☐ e. faculty and student council determines; hands-off policy on my part
 - ☐ f. I determine myself
 - ☐ g. I determine with student council
 - ☐ h. I determine with faculty
 - ☐ i. I determine as result of suggestions from classes
 - ☒ j. I determine after working with faculty and student council
 - ☐ k. lay resource people participate in determining student rules
 - ☐ l. implied rules or regulations arrived at by precedent or unwritten understanding
 - ☐ m. no definite set of rules or regulations

34. How do you arrive at your school policies?

- ☐ a. central office policies make up the local school policies
- ☐ b. no written school policies; others just know them
- ☐ c. I study needs; talk with ^{teachers} others; then decide
- ☒ d. yearly school evaluation results in faculty decision on policy changes
- ☒ e. policies stem from committee reports and faculty acceptance
- ☒ f. students, teachers, and parents work together on representative committee
- ☐ g. when a policy need arises, I secure a volunteer faculty committee to work with me on it.
- ☐ h. I work with committee of grade or department chairman
- ☐ i. some from faculty discussions; some from me
- ☐ j. some from faculty; some from P. T. A. or parent groups; some from me
- ☐ k. some from faculty; some from student groups; some from me

35. What do you do when you find it necessary to make a decision contrary to school policy?

- ☐ a. don't have any written school policies; problem stated does not exist
- ☐ b. do not explain my actions
- ☐ c. do not explain my actions unless teacher reaction reveals a need to
- ☐ d. explain to teachers individually why the action was necessary
- ☒ e. explain at faculty meeting why the action was necessary and I reconsider changing the policy, if they wish it
- ☐ f. explain at faculty meeting why the action was necessary and have faculty reconsider changing the policy if they wish to

36. What is your procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about a problem in carrying out school policy?

- () a. school has no set policies
- () b. tell teacher that school policies all come from the central office and revision requires acceptance by the superintendent or board
- () c. if he can show why the policy is weak, change it
- () d. if he can show why the policy is weak, I bring it up at next faculty meeting for discussion
- (✓) e. suggest that the teacher bring the problem up for faculty discussion
- () f. refer the teacher to a faculty committee set up for this purpose
- () g. explain that no exceptions can be made or merely read the policy

37. How do you react to a teacher who comes to you to oppose a faculty decision?

- (✓) a. suggest that he bring it up for the group to reconsider
- () b. reject it or discourage it as harmful and unprofessional
- () c. explain that he has no choice but to abide by group decision
- (✓) d. help him to adjust to group decision by extended conference
- () e. if he has good point, I pose it to faculty for reconsideration
- () f. if he has a good point, I change the decision

38. How do you react to a teacher's opposition in private conference to your ideas or judgments?
- () a. explain that my judgments result from faculty decisions; if necessary, discourage the criticism on this basis
 - () b. depends upon my mood; when receptive, listen and weigh carefully, sometimes discourage or ignore
 - (✓) c. point out that democracy calls for differences but there are times when a principal must make decisions
 - (✓) d. help him take the issue to the faculty or a faculty committee
 - (✓) e. help him feel free to do this and seek better solution together
 - () f. help him feel free to do this as long as he is constructive and humble in his approach; otherwise discourage or ignore
 - () g. explain my views more carefully; ask that teacher think it over and bring it up again at a later date
 - () h. if I believe that majority is with me, he must fall in line; if he represents a group, try to reach a compromise
 - () i. suggest that he take the issue to the central office
 - () j. laugh it off or politely thank the teacher for having an opinion

39. What do you do when a group of faculty members questions your ideas or judgments at a faculty meeting?

- () a. suggest that they work on the problem for my reconsideration but remind them that major responsibility for the school is mine
- (~~1~~) + b. discuss further; modify my view to secure compromise
- () c. they never do
- () d. persuade them to see my view
- (~~0~~) + e. discuss further; try for consensus; otherwise try for faculty study of the problem and accept their decision
- () f. reconsider my position and go along with them
- () g. request that others express whether they're with me or the group; take defeat only if not backed by majority
- () h. ignore them
- () i. I change if faculty is agreed; otherwise go ahead with my idea
- () j. ask them to see me after the meeting

40. What do you do when an irate parent comes to your office to complain to you about an action of yours?

- () a. try to calm parent and have witness available during discussion
- () b. refrain from defensive statements while explaining reasons for action
- () c. let parent unloose emotion; try to reach common agreement; invite parent to join P.T.A. or another social group
- () d. request that parent put complaint in writing or see superintendent
- (~~1~~) e. try to convince parent that we're not far apart and sell him on my interest in pupil welfare in the action
- (~~1~~) + f. admit if wrong; if right, stand ground tactfully but firmly
- () g. impress parent with good intentions and try to satisfy him by making some concession

neg
A-#
attach DB
Kenny CPG

h1. How do you deal with personal opposition in the community?

- () a. see opponents and lay the cards on the table
- () b. see opponents and explain my position; if opposition continues, ignore it
- () c. see opponents and explain my position; if opposition continues or increases, seek another job
- () d. ignore it
- () e. secure faculty support and stand fast
- (~) f. secure backing of key community individuals or groups to offset opposition
- () g. work through children of parents who are opposing
- () h. work through superintendent
- (~) i. work through lay people friendly with school and opposition
- () j. take problem to faculty for their decision
- () k. almost never occurs; I usually keep everyone happy and alter my ideas or methods if necessary

42. What is your procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about a parent problem?
- () a. secure 3-way conference; try to guide toward solution by compromise
 - () b. secure 3-way conference; try to back teacher
 - () c. secure 3-way conference; I decide whom to back on basis of facts revealed
 - () d. try to get teacher to see parent
 - () e. see parent and try to harmonize
 - () f. such conferences referred to another staff member
 - () g. hands-off policy; get teacher to handle to his best ability
 - () h. suggest teacher maintain his position and support him if necessary
 - () i. delay decision; investigate problem; then make decision
 - () j. suggest that teacher change his attitude and procedure and cooperate with parent

43. What do you do when an irate parent comes to your office to complain about a teacher's action?
- () a. arrange 3-way conference, try to help parent feel some support
 - () b. arrange 3-way conference and mediate in neutral role
 - () c. arrange 3-way conference and try to support teacher
 - () d. offer parent choice of my straightening matter with teacher or 3-way conference
 - () e. seat parent in office; seek out and brief teacher; 3-way conference
 - (✓) f. try to discuss and settle it; if necessary, arrange 3-way conference
 - (✓) g. talk with parent till calmed; send for teacher; 3-way conference
 - () h. suggest he see teacher himself or send for teacher and leave them
 - () i. refer parent to another staff member for such conferences
 - () j. admit if teacher in error; defend teacher if right
 - () k. defend teacher

44. What procedure do you employ when a parent sees you about a promotion or grading problem?
- () a. refer the parent to a staff member who is responsible for such conferences
 - (✓) b. refer the parent to the teacher or teachers involved
 - () c. if parent opposes school decision tell him that promotion policy cannot be changed
 - () d. if parent opposes school decision, accede to his wish and inform that responsibility is his
 - (✓) e. arrange conference with parent and teacher or counselor; back teacher
 - () f. arrange conference with parent and teacher or counselor; stand by my decision
 - () g. arrange conference with parent and teacher or counselor; accede to parent wish; if necessary
 - () h. arrange conference with parent and teacher or counselor; work out trial period, if necessary

15. How do you attempt to protect individual teachers from outside pressures that have evolved from a parent or community group where each side feels justified?

- () a. hands-off policy; teacher handles to best ability
- () b. offer teacher moral backing but I do not get actively involved
- () c. get teacher to see need to build better relations and accede to group wishes
- (X) d. meet with the group and try to explain teacher's position; if his case is weak, inform him of his position
- () e. try to make group work through me and shield teacher; keep teacher out of it and do not inform him, if possible
- () f. confer with least antagonistic of group and bring teacher in; try to guide them to influence others to cooperate
- () g. pose problem to P.T.A. for their solution
- () h. try to arrange open forum meeting of those involved and discussion of issues
- () i. pose problem to P.T.A. for their solution
- () j. weigh my position on basis of potential power of group; if strong get teacher to go along with them; otherwise support teacher
- (X) k. weigh my position on the basis of the principle involved in the issue and take a strong stand
- () l. refer problem to superintendent for his decision or to staff member responsible for community relations
- () m. suggest that parents either put complaint in writing or see superintendent; if not, let teacher do his job

46. How do you deal with community special interest groups who attempt to influence the school program?
- () a. ignore them
 - () b. meet with them; if no cooperation ignore them
 - () c. explain problem to lay people friendly with school and pressure group; try to get them to sway group or mediate; if no results, ignore them
 - () d. after meeting with them, attempt to get them to work through P.T.A.; if no cooperation, try to ignore them
 - () e. secure faculty support and stand fast
 - () f. promise to cooperate but take stand that they cannot dictate policies; make decision after weighing issues and inform them
 - () g. comply with the group's pressure
 - () h. join their group; refuse to compete; win them over personally
 - (/) i. attempt to sell them on the total school program
 - () j. take problem to faculty for their decision
 - () k. refer group to the superintendent or board of education
 - () l. present the problem and ask the P.T.A. to assume responsibility for solving it

47. How do you use the P.T.A.?

- ☒ a. to help interpret program and problems to community
- ☐ b. have one but make little use of it
- ☐ c. as planning group for developing the curriculum
- ☐ d. to participate in calendar formation; administering health program, similar planning activities
- ☐ e. to help community with its problems
- ☐ f. don't have one
- ☐ g. as sounding board for program changes or new policies
- ☐ h. to help purchase supplies, materials, etc. for school needs
- ☐ i. as planning group for school policies
- ☐ j. to aid in classes, field trips, assemblies, clubs, and activities, etc.
- ☐ k. for school improvement projects; no financial aid

48. How do you use the community in forming school policies?

- ☐ a. I make very little use of the community for policy formation
- ☐ b. I get ideas from individuals
- ☐ c. I get ideas from key lay people
- ☐ ~~d. my insight from knowing community thinking~~
- ☐ e. teachers study lay opinions prior to policy adoption
- ☐ f. parents are invited to participate in faculty meetings on policy issues
- ☐ ~~g. we have a standing lay policies committee~~
- ☐ h. P.T.A. representatives serve on a policy committee
- ☐ ~~i. temporary lay committees help form policies as needs arise~~
- ☐ j. representatives from community organizations serve with a teacher policy committee

49. How do you use the community for changing the school curriculum?

- ☐ a. make very little use of parents for curricular change
- ☐ b. I talk with individuals
- ☐ c. representatives participate in planning conferences with the administration
- ☐ d. through lay participation with extra-curricular activities such as band, sports, clubs, etc.
- ☐ e. through occasional P.T.A. study groups
- ☒ f. through a standing lay-faculty curriculum committee
- ☐ g. representatives participate in planning conferences with faculty members
- ☒ h. parents plan and work within subject fields with teachers

50. How do you use the community in the planning of such special phases of the program as band, health, sports, and dances?

- ☒ a. I make little use of the community for such activities
- ☐ b. I talk with lay groups or organizations
- ☐ c. I talk with individuals
- ☐ d. standing lay committees plan such activities
- ☐ e. total program is presented to P.T.A.
- ☒ f. small groups such as band parents, homeroom mothers, dad's club, etc. participate in planning
- ☐ g. P.T.A. small groups participate in planning as needs arise
- ☐ h. community organizations such as civic clubs, health agencies, etc. help the staff plan

51. How do you use the community in planning field trips?

- () a. I make very little use of the community for such planning
- () b. I secure parental aid for transportation
- () c. I contact the places to visit and key lay personnel
- () d. community resource file available for teacher use
- () e. have teachers make pre-arrangements prior to opening of school year
- () f. teachers do their own planning with class parent group
- () g. teachers work through a lay committee set up for this purpose

52. When do you use the community in pre-planning or regular faculty meetings?

- (✓) a. resource people called into meetings as school needs arise
- () b. very little use of community in faculty meetings
- () c. for help in determining school policies
- () d. for help to plan the yearly calendar, field trips, or related activities
- () e. for participation in the regular order of business of the school program

53. How do you determine which community people to ask for assistance in the work of the school?

- ☐ a. those whom I believe to have the most to offer
- ☒ b. invite all interested to assist
- ☐ c. use individuals, civic clubs, churches, and other agencies to recommend
- ☐ d. issue questionnaires to find areas in which people want to help
- ☐ e. by knowing most of the people living in the community and their ability, interests, time available
- ☐ f. use community leaders
- ☒ g. those most interested in the welfare of the school
- ☐ h. rarely use any
- ☐ i. have a teacher group determine which people to ask
- ☐ j. have P.T.A. or P.T.A. committee determine
- ☐ k. teachers decide individually for own needs

54. What means do you use for contacting parent groups?

- ☐ a. through pupils; orally
- ☒ b. through pupils by letters or notes or bulletins
- ☐ c. through teachers visiting the homes of the parent groups
- ☐ d. one staff member handles contacting
- ☐ e. secretary assumes responsibility by phoning them
- ☐ f. by parent phone committee
- ☐ g. directly by letters or notes
- ☐ h. directly by bulletins in the mail
- ☐ i. directly by phone

55. What do you do to prepare the secretarial staff for working with the community?
- ☐ a. involve her as directly as possible in dealing with parents while continually keeping her aware of the importance of her role in good public relations
 - ☐ b. help her as problems arise
 - ☐ c. provide for conferences with the outgoing secretary and me; possibly include teachers and supervisors
 - ☐ d. explain school policies and procedures; have periodic conferences and work closely with her in early stages as part of on-the-job training
 - ☐ e. have her oriented by an assigned helping teacher who meets periodically with her
 - ☐ f. acknowledge her staff status and include her as a participant in faculty meetings or other phases of the teacher in-service program
 - ☒ g. no secretarial help
56. What do you do to make the custodian part of the school program?
- ☐ a. no custodian
 - ☐ b. very little
 - ☐ c. pay him for all extra services
 - ☒ d. frequently discuss his work with him and show an interest in his job
 - ☐ e. frequently refer children to him for guidance purposes or help with their personal projects
 - ☒ f. keep him informed on policies, procedures, and current school activities
 - ☐ g. include him often as a participant in socials, assemblies, or other activities just short of professional participation
 - ☐ h. have frequent conferences that involve sharing information about problem students or frequently refer teachers to him for this expressed purpose
 - ☐ i. have him serve on committees or attend faculty meetings as a participant with teacher status

57. What is your policy regarding making speeches in the community?

- ☐ a. try to serve when asked but feel the need to draw a line due to demands on time
- ☐ b. rarely or never accept
- ☐ c. welcome and encourage requests
- ☐ d. very rarely requested to speak; fulfill when asked
- ☐ e. make them when pressed but do not encourage requests
- ☐ f. accept only when topic is one on which I'm competent
- ☐ g. respond only when it will help school relations

58. What is your policy regarding other staff members making speeches in the community?

- ☐ a. encourage some teachers but not others
- ☐ b. recommend teachers for topics where I don't feel competent
- ☐ c. encourage teachers to make all speeches requested
- ☐ d. allow if not critical of school or administration
- ☐ e. encourage that they accept those that will help school public relations
- ☐ f. hands-off policy
- ☐ g. I recommend their names to community organizations or groups in hopes that they'll be asked to speak

59. To what extent do you participate in public elections and issues?

- ☐ a. active in local politics
- ☐ b. active in civic groups and make public talks
- ☐ c. quite active in campaigns when issue is important
- ☐ d. whenever important local community issues are involved
- ☐ e. whenever an issue concerns the school or education
- ☐ f. as a member of a community organization but not as an educator
- ☐ g. do not publicly but try to influence local politicians privately
- ☐ h. attend public meetings
- ☐ i. within sphere of friends, relatives, school associates
- ☐ j. encourage teachers participation
- ☐ k. keep out of them completely

60. In what community organizations do you participate most actively?

- ☐ a. social or country clubs
- ☐ b. veterans' organizations as American Legion
- ☒ c. religious institutions
- ☐ d. business or professional groups as Chamber of Commerce
- ☒ e. community council, civic clubs, or welfare agencies
- ☐ f. child or youth groups or centers as Sunday School, Boy Scouts, recreational centers
- ☐ g. fraternal organizations as Rotary, Masons, Women's Groups

61. What is your procedure in the selection of a new teacher?
- (✓) a. interview all candidates and decide
 - () b. interview conducted by committee of teachers and me; joint decision
 - () c. I interview and present data to committee of teachers who decide
 - (✓) d. interview determines most selections; accept some from recommendations by people I know
 - () e. select from those recommended by people I know; some are interviewed prior to decision
 - () f. selected from references and application; some are interviewed prior to decision
 - () g. take what I can get; very little choice in selection
 - () h. central office contacts candidates; consults with me; central office makes decision
 - () i. central office makes decision without consulting me

62. What do you do to help a new teacher become oriented?

- () a. early observations by me; I am ready to step in and help as needs appear
- () b. provide time for an older teacher to help by periodic conferences and being available as needed
- () c. conferences with me; general introduction to teachers and/or student body
- () d. provision is made for released time for new teachers to visit other classes in the school or in another school
- () e. refer responsibility to a buddy teacher
- () f. allow most help to come naturally from new teacher initiative, regular meetings of the staff, and school routines
- (✓) g. help secure living quarters; provide information on churches, community mores, etc.
- () h. arrange orientation and conferences prior to arrival of other teachers for the school year
- (✓) i. provide handbook or special bulletins, needed materials, etc.; help teacher feel free to see me whenever necessary
- () j. early grade or departmental meetings provide the necessary orientation and older teachers provide the most help
- () k. take teachers on tours of the school and community

63. How do you make yourself accessible to teachers for conferences?

- ☐ a. teachers are free to confer with me on my daily rounds of the school
- ☐ b. provide a definite time during the day when school is not in session
- ☐ c. openly encourage that they contact me at my house
- ☐ d. provide a minimum of one yearly scheduled conference with each teacher
- ☐ e. encourage conferences by looking for signs that a teacher needs or wishes one
- ☐ f. appointments can be made by teachers in advance
- ☒ g. available any time teachers find me unoccupied
- ☐ h. provide a definite time during the day when school is in session

64. What is your procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about a problem involving another teacher?

- ☐ a. bring issue to faculty by generalizing problem and disguising its source
- ☒ b. arrange 3-way conference; hear both sides; give best advice
- ☐ c. arrange 3-way conference; raise questions; leave them with decision
- ☐ d. hands-off policy; either laugh it off or suggest he straighten it out with other teacher
- ☐ e. usually try to abide by seniority and back the more experienced teacher
- ☐ f. reschedule, transfer, or remove teacher at fault
- ☒ g. keep focusing on strengths of other teacher and try to help remove issue from specifics; I refrain from commitments

65. What is your procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about a personal problem?
- ☐ a. refer teacher to doctor, minister, psychiatrist, or social agency
 - ☐ b. try to avoid such discussions where possible
 - ☐ c. refer teacher to another staff member
 - ☐ d. give best advice
 - ☒ e. help teacher clarify issues and make his own decision
 - ☐ f. listen but do not comment any more than necessary
66. What is your procedure in dealing with a teacher who comes to you about an instructional problem?
- ☒ a. offer best suggestions I know
 - ☐ b. offer best suggestions I know and I do some demonstration teaching
 - ☒ c. offer best suggestions I know and refer to supervisor for additional help
 - ☒ d. offer best suggestions and request opportunity to observe teacher
 - ☐ e. refer the teacher to the supervisor
 - ☐ f. refer him to a teacher committee set up for this purpose
 - ☐ g. arrange series of periodic conferences and some class visitations
 - ☐ h. offer released time to visit classes in the school or in another school
 - ☒ i. offer materials and/or professional literature

67. What do you do to establish pupil achievement standards?
- () a. closely supervise classroom teaching
 - () b. provide a professional library with current periodicals and new professional books
 - () c. request that teachers give homework
 - () d. no attempt is made to establish any standards
 - () e. provide periodic testing programs
 - () f. distribute courses of study and other similar materials that establish basic requirements
 - () g. confer with grade or department chairmen and help influence others through them
 - () h. focus grade or department meetings on standards and participate in as many as possible
 - () i. focus on standards in faculty meeting discussion
 - () j. provide as much instructional material as possible
68. What do you do in your work with teachers to bring about changes in course offerings or content?
- () a. sell the staff on the need to improve the program
 - () b. provide released time for visitations to other classes and other projects that will lead to program improvement
 - () c. close supervision of classroom teaching
 - () d. little or nothing directly; await faculty suggestions and encourage study of them
 - () e. get faculty interested in new texts, periodicals, professional library, etc.
 - () f. initiate workshops, study groups, etc., for faculty to work on common problems
 - () g. suggest formal evaluations of the total program
 - () h. make little or no attempt to get such changes
 - () i. get staff to undertake an experimental project

69. How do you find out what your teachers are teaching?

- ☐ a. work closely with grade or department heads
- ☐ b. work closely with the supervisor
- ☐ c. have frequent, casual talks with students, parents, teachers
- ☐ d. frequent talks with and observations of teachers
- ☐ e. substitute in classes frequently
- ☐ f. attend numerous small group meetings of teachers where discussions of their classroom work is conducted
- ☐ g. request lesson plans from all teachers
- ☐ h. find out from faculty meeting discussions of classroom work
- ☐ i. don't try to
- ☐ j. I study the results of our testing program
- ☐ k. examine the courses of study
- ☐ l. don't know all but conferences with teachers and trouble shooting on problems provides sufficient information about those who need the most help
- ☐ m. find out in workshops or other phases of the faculty in-service program other than regular meetings

70. How do you determine when to visit classrooms?

- ☐ a. when the supervisor recommends that a teacher needs help
- ☐ b. when I hear negative reports about the teaching
- ☒ c. when I feel a teacher wants my help
- ☐ d. when I learn of outstanding work going on in a class
- ☐ e. on random, unplanned occasions
- ☒ f. make periodic, lengthy visitations
- ☐ g. make daily rounds and drop in on almost all classes for very brief periods
- ☒ h. whenever teachers invite me

71. What do you do when you observe a classroom?

- ☐ a. sit quietly and take written notes
- ☐ b. sit quietly; nothing else
- ☒ c. sit quietly; enter discussion only if requested to
- ☐ d. stand quietly in front or at side of room
- ☐ e. move about the room and observe what students are doing
- ☒ f. enter freely into class activities and discussions
- ☐ g. enter class activities and teach some, if teacher permits
- ☐ h. stand in front or at side of room and participate
- ☐ i. enter class activities to extent of participating in discussions only to provide necessary information
- ☐ j. visits are always brief; I look for things I know cause difficulty
- ☐ k. I never observe teachers
- ☐ l. responsibility for observing referred to another administrator or supervisor

72. What do you do after you have observed a class?

- () a. nothing; leave as though I hadn't observed
- () b. nothing at the time; arrange for a conference with the teacher and emphasize the areas of improvement needed
- () c. nothing at the time; comment later to the teacher by a written note
- () d. nothing at the time; arrange for a later conference with the teacher and attempt to balance the teacher's strengths and needs for improvement in evaluating
- () e. nothing at the time; evaluate the class period with the teacher at a later conference
- () f. discuss it at the time; emphasize the teacher's strengths
- () g. discuss it at the time; attempt to balance the teacher's strengths and needs for improvement in evaluating
- () h. discuss it at the time; emphasize the areas of improvement needed
- () i. let the teacher know how he has done indirectly by commenting to the class in a brief personal evaluation of them
- () j. never observe classes
- () k. responsibility for observing referred to another administrator or supervisor

73. How do you go about trying to improve a teacher's work when the teacher does not ask for help?
- () a. through faculty meeting discussions
 - () b. await the right moment; when it comes, get over the idea that none are perfect and all need some help to improve
 - () c. don't try to
 - () d. use visiting consultants from a college to help with this problem
 - () e. refer the problem to the supervisor
 - () f. observe and evaluate the teacher's class
 - () g. tell teacher frankly that his work needs improvement
 - () h. offer him remedial help
 - () i. explain that the class is not going well and offer suggestions
 - () j. involve him in child study groups, committee work, or other phases of the in-service program

7h. How do you go about rating your teachers?

- () a. I evaluate on a central office form; evaluation results not known to teacher
- () b. I evaluate on my school form; evaluation results not known to teacher
- () c. I evaluate on a central office form; discuss evaluation with teacher
- () d. I evaluate on my school form; discuss evaluation with teacher
- () e. I evaluate on a central office form; teacher fills out similar form; evaluation discussed with teacher
- () f. I evaluate on my school form; teacher fills out similar form; evaluation discussed with teacher
- () g. I evaluate on a central office form; teacher fills out similar form; evaluation results not known to teacher
- () h. I evaluate on my school form; teacher fills out similar form; evaluation results not known to teacher
- (✓) i. I evaluate mentally; evaluation results not known to teacher
- (✓) j. I evaluate mentally; evaluations periodically discussed with teacher

75. How do you reward a teacher for good work?

- ☐ a. by notifying the highest rated teachers
- ☐ b. by advancing his status
- ☐ c. indirectly by complimenting his class, displaying his class work or telling others so it gets back to him
- ☐ d. by use of faculty bulletins
- ☒ e. by personal compliment or note
- ☐ f. by acknowledging outstanding jobs done to the faculty or student body
- ☐ g. by informing the central office
- ☐ h. by community acknowledgments in the P.T.A. meetings or local paper
- ☐ i. by decreasing his work load
- ☐ j. by giving him more responsibility or special work
- ☐ k. by extra salary increments

76. How do you deal with the teacher whose way of work you feel is harmful to the school?
- () a. by lessening his responsibilities to protect students
 - () b. by referring problem to a supervisor and asking that he correct it
 - () c. by giving him a stiff reprimand in person
 - () d. by frankly telling him personally or by note; no further step
 - () e. by letting things ride; then tell teacher frankly and dismiss, if necessary
 - () f. indirectly by sufficient hinting until teacher realizes value of resigning; if necessary dismiss
 - () g. by frankly telling him in person or by note; dismissal if it continues
 - () h. by increasing his work load
 - () i. by telling the central office
 - () j. by use of faculty bulletins or indirectly at faculty meetings but not mentioning names
 - () k. by informing him of complaints from others
 - () l. by an evaluative conference designed to focus on the problem without any criticism

77. What procedure do you use in dismissing a teacher?

- () a. inform or confer with superintendent or supervisor;
central office notifies teacher
- () b. inform or confer with superintendent or supervisor;
then notify teacher in person
- () c. confer with superintendent or supervisor and teacher
in 3-way conference
- () d. inform teacher in person and central office at about
same time
- (✓) e. inform teacher in advance of notifying central office
to allow time for the teacher to take initiative
- (✓) f. prepare him for it gradually and help him locate another
position
- () g. keep hinting indirectly to teacher till he gets the point
- () h. inform teacher through notes or letters
- () i. have never attempted to dismiss or fire a teacher

78. How do you determine the use of internal funds?

- () a. all funds are earmarked for groups that turned them in; dispersed to them without my approval
- () b. all funds are earmarked for groups that turned them in; dispersed to them with my approval
- () c. funds earmarked for activities and clubs for their own use; other funds require total faculty or teacher committee approval for use
- () d. funds earmarked for activities and clubs for their own use; other funds require my approval for use
- () e. grades or departments use funds with teacher committee approval; funds from activities require my approval for use
- () f. total faculty discussion determines allocation of funds; funds are not for private use
- () g. activity funds require approval of a standing student committee or student government
- () h. administrative committee or board determines use
- () i. teacher committee determines use
- () j. I decide on basis of needs and requests; funds are not earmarked for use
- () k. responsibility rests with central office

79. How do you initiate charity fund raising drives?

- ☐ a. I initiate with teachers and parents together
- ☐ b. I initiate with students
- ☐ c. I initiate with students and teachers together
- ☐ d. I initiate with faculty
- ☒ e. pupils or teachers initiate through classes, clubs, or student government
- ☐ f. teachers initiate after faculty discussion and consent
- ☐ g. parents initiate
- ☒ h. tradition results in similar plan from year to year and teacher or I initiate
- ☐ i. don't have any
- ☐ j. central office initiates; I follow their policy

80. Where do you draw the line on personal-social relationships with the faculty during the routine school day?

- ☐ a. businesslike and professional at all times (as a business manager should be)
- ☐ b. businesslike, but friendly
- ☐ c. warm in my office; more businesslike elsewhere
- ☐ d. formality varies with individual teachers
- ☐ e. usually easy and friendly with all but draw the line on familiarity
- ☐ f. sober, group member
- ☐ g. formal when students are present; informal otherwise
- ☒ h. almost always sociable and warm with all
- ☐ i. don't get to see much of teachers during the day

81. Where do you draw the line on personal-social relationships with the faculty in non-professional socializing after school hours?
- ☒ a. socialize on basis of spreading myself almost equally among all
 - ☐ b. not too familiar; not wise to get too close
 - ☒ c. socialize with all at least once a year; socialize frequently with those who share my interests
 - ☐ d. rarely or never socialize; responsibilities and other activities limit interactions with teachers
 - ☐ e. socialize with a few who share my interests
82. What are the jobs of the people you eat lunch with?
- ☐ a. a group of administrators or supervisors
 - ☒ b. pupils
 - ☐ c. different teachers each day or week
 - ☐ d. custodians
 - ☐ e. Rotary, Lions, or a similar group
 - ☐ f. secretary
 - ☐ g. an administrator or supervisor
 - ☐ h. one or two teachers
 - ☐ i. family
 - ☐ j. a certain group of teachers
 - ☐ k. salesman
 - ☐ l. a certain group of pupils
 - ☒ m. visitors to the school
 - ☐ n. any teachers present

83. How do you get teachers to evaluate their progress as a total faculty?

- (✓) a. by frequent referrals to our philosophy and goals in faculty meetings
- () b. by yearly in-service workshops
- () c. by distributing a questionnaire to the faculty about our progress and discussing the results in a faculty meeting
- () d. very little or nothing
- (✓) e. by planned total school evaluation procedures such as use of "Evaluative Criteria" or invite a consultant from a nearby college
- () f. by having evaluation used as a planned, ongoing procedure in all committee work
- () g. by having grade or department committees evaluate themselves yearly and report their progress to the total faculty
- () h. by a periodic process of small group work in faculty meetings

84. How do you go about evaluating your school-community relations?

- () a. present questionnaires to or ask community groups or organizations to evaluate
- () b. present questionnaires to P.T.A. periodically or utilize periodic P.T.A. discussions for evaluation
- () c. occasionally present questionnaire to parents
- () d. have questionnaires presented to total or sample of total community to evaluate relationships
- () e. haven't attempted to do this
- () f. informal talks and encouraging parents to express themselves freely in person or by telephoning school
- () g. initiate periodic faculty discussions on community relationships or present periodic questionnaires to faculty
- () h. informally call matter to faculty attention to help them evaluate the relationships or present questionnaires to faculty on occasion
- () i. I occasionally bring up such question for P.T.A. discussion
- () j. continual observations by me of teacher and parent attitudes and behavior

(The two following questions to be answered by schools that have a 12th. grade)

85. What procedure do you employ in parent-pupil conferences that deal with future education or vocation?

- () a. provide parents with available facts for their decision; I supply best advice that I can
- () b. provide parents with available facts for their decision; I refrain from expressing opinions
- () c. provide for such help through parent group lecture - discussions led by guidance personnel or consultants from higher institutions
- () d. provide for such help through parent group lecture-discussions led by me
- () e. such conferences referred to guidance personnel
- () f. such conferences referred to the teacher involved
- () g. confer with pupil and offer best suggestions
- () h. do not have such conferences

86. How do you deal with student social cliques (clubs that may become cliques, sororities and fraternities, etc.) in the school?
- () a. emphasis placed upon re-grouping from year to year to break up potential cliques
 - () b. contact parents when they emerge and secure their cooperation to get them to disband
 - () c. school stays out of these; responsibility belongs to parents
 - () d. by rules and regulations in school policy that are enforced to keep any social cliques away from school; discipline for infractions
 - () e. tolerate them; when they get harmful, call students and parents in for action to correct
 - () f. provide extensive activity program in school so all have clubs to join

When you have finished responding to this instrument look back to be sure that you have provided a designation for every item. An item that does not apply to you should be marked (N).

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Morton Alpren was born in New York City on March 28, 1922. He graduated from George Washington High School, New York, in 1936 and spent the next four years in New York as a salesman in the textile field. He served in the United States Air Force from 1942 to 1945 as an instructor and supervisor of chemical warfare training.

Mr. Alpren resumed his work in the business field as treasurer and personnel supervisor of the same firm, while pursuing undergraduate work in his spare time. He began to devote full time to education in 1948 and received the Bachelor of Science degree, cum laude, at New York University in 1950. He received the Master of Arts degree at Columbia University in 1951 and pursued graduate studies at the University of Wyoming and at New York University. Matriculation toward the degree of Doctor of Education was initiated in conjunction with a fellowship award from the University of Florida in the summer of 1952.

Prior to entering the University of Florida, he worked as a private tutor and served as a research assistant and consultant in the 1950 Connecticut Study of Education. He taught mathematics and Core English at Manhasset High School, New York, for two years where he met and married Patricia Farrell.

Mr. Alpren is a member of Pi Mu Epsilon and Phi Delta Kappa. He currently serves as a county supervisor in Starke, Florida.

This dissertation was prepared under the direction of the chairman of the candidate's supervisory committee and has been approved by all members of the committee. It was submitted to the Dean of the College of Education and to the Graduate Council and was approved as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

January 30, 1954

J. B. White
Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Kenneth Wiles
Chairman

J. B. White
Clara M. Olson

Vernon A. Jones

Pauline Hilliard

Wm. G. Carleton